

EMPEDOCLES

OF ACRAGAS

Volume II: The Testimonia

The Greek and Latin of Hermann Diels
with a new English translation
and notes

INTRODUCTION

WHAT IS LOST

Diogenes Laertius closes his *Life* with a figure. The *On Nature* and the *Purifications* together, he says, ran to five thousand lines, and a *Medical Discourse* to six hundred. The Byzantine lexicon we call the *Suda* gives a smaller count: two books, about two thousand lines. Diels thought Diogenes' figure too large and would have halved it. Volume I of this edition prints four hundred and eighty-four lines.

So between a quarter and a tenth of the verse survives, depending on which ancient count is believed, and that fraction is itself generous, because the four hundred and eighty-four lines are not four hundred and eighty-four consecutive lines. They are a hundred and fifty-four scraps, most of them one or two lines long, preserved because somebody quoted them in the course of arguing about something else.

This volume is the rest of the evidence. It is not Empedocles; it is the record of what other people said he said, and the distance between those two things is the whole reason the volume exists. Ninety-nine numbered testimonia, drawn from fifty-two authors writing across nine centuries in three languages, are printed here complete, with the Greek and Latin that Diels established and a new English translation facing it.

The proper attitude to this material is neither credulity nor dismissal. A doxographer's single sentence and a page of Aristotle arguing with a text in front of him are both evidence, and they are not evidence of the same kind or the same weight. Most of the work of editing a collection like this consists in keeping that difference visible.

WHAT A TESTIMONIUM IS

A fragment is a quotation. A testimonium is a report, and a report has an author, a purpose, and a date, all of which shape what it preserves.

Consider what happens to one doctrine across this book. Empedocles held that the sea is what the earth gave off under pressure. At A 66 the phrase survives in Aëtius as "the sweat of the earth," which has the ring of the verse. At A 25 Aristotle quotes the same phrase to complain that a metaphor is not an explanation — "for poetry, put that way, he has

perhaps said enough; but for knowing the nature of a thing, he has not." And at A 66 again, Philo describes the same process at length in a Latin translation of an Armenian version of a lost Greek original, and calls it muddy water. Three witnesses, three distances, one doctrine, and only the middle one tells us what the words were *for*.

Or consider A 14, where four authors report that Empedocles stopped a wind. Plutarch, twice, describes an engineering work: a cleft in a hillside walled off so that a sickly wind no longer reached the plain, with the fall in disease that would follow. Clement has the deed but not the wall. Nicomachus has only the epithet, Averter of Winds, and files it beside a man who walked on air. The plainest version is the earliest, and the sequence from Plutarch to Nicomachus is the history of a legend in four steps.

The reader will find this pattern everywhere, and it is the reason the notes below each entry say who is speaking and why, rather than simply reporting what was said.

THE CHAIN

Most of the doctrinal testimonia in this book descend from one book, and it is worth knowing how.

Theophrastus, Aristotle's successor at the Lyceum, wrote a work on the opinions of the natural philosophers and a separate one *On the Senses*. He had the poems. From his survey there descended a series of epitomes, each shorter than the last, and from those an anonymous handbook of philosophical opinions arranged by topic. That handbook is lost. What survives are two later compilations which plainly drew on it: a treatise on the opinions of the philosophers that circulated under Plutarch's name and is not his, and the anthology of Stobaeus.

In 1879 Diels compared the two, reconstructed their common source, and gave it the name Aëtius, which he took from a passing reference in Theodoret. That reconstruction has stood, and it is one of the great feats of nineteenth-century scholarship. But its status should be stated plainly, because this volume prints more testimonia from Aëtius than from anyone else. An Aëtius notice is a modern reconstruction of a lost epitome of a lost handbook which itself compressed Theophrastus, who was reading the poem. There are four removes between the reader and the verse, and each of them removed argument and kept conclusions.

That is why the same doctrine so often arrives as a single stripped sentence. It is also why, at A 61, the two branches of the tradition give flatly contradictory figures for the distance of the moon, and Diels judged that neither preserves what Empedocles wrote. The numeral survived; the terms it related did not.

Against this, Theophrastus himself survives entire on one subject. His chapter on Empedocles' theory of perception is printed here as A 86, and it is the most valuable document in the volume.

The longest chain of all runs through A 70, where a treatise *On Plants* by Nicolaus of Damascus passed from Greek into Syriac, from Syriac into Arabic, from Arabic into Latin, and calls Empedocles by a name no Greek would recognise: *Abrucalis*. What it reports — that plants desire, perceive, feel pleasure and pain, and have sex — is exactly what the Greek notice on the same page says, and what fragment B 79 says in verse. The two ends of the chain agree. Only the middle is illegible, and that is a useful thing to know about chains.

THE MAN

The Life occupies the first part of this volume, and it is a compilation rather than a biography. Its value lies in Diogenes' habit of naming his authorities and letting them contradict one another: six of them in the first twelve lines, four different names for the father, three ages at death, and five separate accounts of how he died.

Where Diogenes adjudicates, he does it on evidence. The chronology still in use rests on an argument of Apollodorus reported at A 1 § 52: an Olympic victory recorded for "Empedocles" in 496 BC must belong to the grandfather, since the philosopher's own death at sixty — the figure Aristotle gives — would otherwise make him impossibly old. A birth around 492 follows, and nothing since has dislodged it.

What the Life supports, beyond the dates, is a man of a particular and consistent kind. He was rich, of a house that kept racehorses. He refused a crown, on Aristotle's authority. His politics were levelling: a tyranny stopped at a dinner party, a celebrated physician refused a family monument on grounds of equality, an oligarchy of the Thousand dissolved. He dowered the daughters of citizens who had nothing. He wore purple, a golden girdle, bronze shoes and a Delphic wreath, and four unconnected witnesses say so. He was a working physician whom

Galen lists, with his pupil Pausanias, as one of the medical traditions of Italy, beside Cos and Cnidus. He diverted two rivers at his own expense to end a plague at Selinus. And he sacrificed an ox made of honey and barley-meal, or of spices, because he held that killing was murder and still had to make a public offering.

Timaeus of Tauromenium, the best historian in the collection, thought the man of the poems and the man of the assembly did not match — moderate and decent in one, boastful and self-loving in the other. It is at least as likely that a man who believed he had escaped the cycle of birth would take no interest in rank, and that the two are one position seen from two sides.

Timaeus is also the author of the finest piece of source criticism in the ancient literature on Empedocles. At A 1 §§ 71 and 72 he takes apart the story of the leap into Etna with arguments any modern historian would make: the host's estate was in the wrong city; Pausanias, who supposedly witnessed a deification, put up no monument and could easily have afforded one; and Empedocles, who wrote at length about fire, never once mentions the volcano. Diogenes prints the demolition alongside the story. The appendix to this volume traces what happened next, which is that the demolition made no difference at all.

THE ROOTS AND THE POWERS

Four roots — fire, air, water, earth — and two powers that move them, Love and Strife. Nothing comes to be and nothing perishes; what changes is proportion and arrangement. That much is agreed by every witness in this book, and it is the doctrine for which Empedocles is remembered.

Three things about it are not agreed, and this edition does not conceal them.

The first is the divine names. Fragment 6 names the roots as Zeus, Hera, Aidoneus and Nestis, and the ancient witnesses supply incompatible keys. Aëtius at A 33 makes Hera the air and Aidoneus the earth. The Homeric Allegories and Hippolytus, on the same page, reverse the pair; and Diogenes, summarising the doctrine at A 1 § 76, reverses it too. The modern handbooks follow Aëtius, who stands alone against three. Only Hippolytus argues his case, and his argument is good: air is Aidoneus, the unseen one, because we see all things through it and it alone we do

not see. What is being followed today is a choice, not a consensus, and the notes say so wherever the question arises.

The second is the cycle. Simplicius states it symmetrically — a world formed under Love and a world formed under Strife, alternating without end — and quotes the poem for it. Aristotle says flatly that Empedocles passed over the world-formation under Love because it could not be made to work. Both witnesses are printed, and the question is open.

The third is mixture. Aristotle charges that on Empedocles' physics nothing is ever truly blended, only stacked side by side like a wall of bricks; the doxographers go further and credit him with particles smaller than the roots. The verse reads otherwise, and the reason it reads otherwise is the subject of the next section.

BONE IS A RATIO

A 78 is the most important doctrinal testimony in this volume, and its importance is in Aristotle's sentence rather than in the figures around it.

Empedocles was asked what bone is. He did not answer that it is earth, or fire, or a mixture of all four. He answered that it is a proportion: two parts of one thing, four of another, blended in a fixed ratio, and it is that ratio which makes the stuff bone rather than flesh. Aristotle, who disagrees with nearly everything else in this book, records the doctrine and concedes that on this point Empedocles was "led by the truth itself."

The claim is that what makes a thing the thing it is, is a number. Set beside it the charge about bricks, and the charge dissolves: a wall of bricks has no ratio, and a thing defined by ratio is not a wall of bricks. Set beside it the fragments, where the ratio for bone is given in verse, and the testimony and the poem turn out to be saying one thing in two registers.

Aristotle then turns the doctrine against itself, in a passage printed on the same opening. If the soul is the ratio of a mixture, and flesh and bone have different ratios, then a body must have as many souls as it has kinds of tissue. Theophrastus presses the same point harder at A 86 § 23: bone and hair are made of the elements too, so bone and hair

should perceive. Neither objection is answered anywhere in the surviving material.

THE SENSES, AND THE CHAPTER THAT REFUTES THEM

A 86 is a single Diels number and a whole book: the entire chapter Theophrastus devoted to Empedocles in *On the Senses*, the first history of a philosophical problem that anyone wrote.

Its first half sets out the doctrine. Perception happens when effluences from a thing fit the passages of a sense organ — too large and they do not enter, too small and they pass through untouched. The eye is a lantern: fire within, a screen of finer stuff around it, and passages for fire and water lying alternately, so that white and black are seen through different apertures of one organ. The ear is a bell, and Empedocles called it a sprout of flesh. Thought is a property of blood, and a man is slow or quick or eloquent according to how the elements lie in the blood of a particular limb. That is the oldest temperament theory in Europe.

Its second half takes the account apart, and is the more informative half, because to refute a position Theophrastus must first state it exactly. Several things we know about Empedocles survive only because they were worth objecting to.

Three of the objections are still good. If perception is things fitting passages, the passages are either empty — and Empedocles denied the void outright — or full, in which case perception never stops. If like is known by like, an eye of fire and water can see white and black, but grey matches nothing. And explaining hearing by a bell inside the head only moves the question: when the bell sounds, what hears *that*?

The most interesting remark in the chapter is a single sentence at § 20, and it appears to have gone unnoticed since. Under the reign of Love, where all things are drawn together and nothing flows off, there could be no perception at all. Theophrastus has seen that the physics of the cosmic cycle and the physics of the senses do not sit easily together — that a doctrine of effluence requires a world in which things are coming apart.

ONE POEM OR TWO

Whether the *On Nature* and the *Purifications* are two works or one has been argued for two centuries, and the testimonia bear on it more than is usually noticed.

Three notices in this volume show the physics and the religion joined at the seam. At A 62, Hippolytus reports that evils reach as far as the moon and no further, because the region above it is purer — which makes the moon the boundary of the world of exile described in the *Purifications*, and makes that world a piece of cosmology. At A 96, a doxographer records that Empedocles identified mind with soul, and draws the consequence that no animal is irrational in the strict sense: which is precisely what the transmigration of B 117 requires, and turns a religious doctrine into a physical one. And at A 98, the last of the testimonia, a Latin physician reports that the school distinguished two kinds of madness — one with a bodily cause, and one that is *ex animi purgamento*, from a purification of the soul. *Purgamentum* is the Latin for *katharmos*. Whatever divided the two poems, the men who read both did not think the division ran through the mind.

Against this stands A 85, where death is the separating out of the four roots, "so that in this respect death is common to body and soul alike." If the soul is a ratio and the ratio comes apart, nothing survives; and the wandering daimon of the *Purifications* has nowhere to go. That contradiction is the oldest unsettled question about Empedocles, and this volume does not settle it either. What it does is print both sides on facing pages and mark the join.

ARISTOTLE'S SHADOW

A reader should finish this book with one suspicion firmly in place: a great deal of what we think we know about Empedocles is in Aristotle's vocabulary.

Empedocles wrote *rhizōmata*, roots — a live metaphor, of things from which growth proceeds. Aristotle writes *stoicheia*, elements, a term from his own analysis, and it is through Aristotle that the four elements entered European thought with Empedocles' name attached. He speaks of matter and form in reporting a man who had neither word. He attributes to Empedocles the position of a philosopher who has taken a view about *archai*, first principles, in a debate Aristotle himself organised.

None of this is dishonesty. It is what happens when a systematic thinker reports an unsystematic predecessor, and Aristotle is still the best witness we have precisely because he is arguing rather than cataloguing. But his reports and his objections run together in the same sentence, and the notes in this volume mark the seam wherever it can be found.

Two works printed under his name are not his. The *Problems* at A 69 and *On Breath* at A 78 are compilations of his school, and are marked Pseudo-Aristotle throughout.

THIS EDITION

The Greek and Latin are Diels's, from the third edition of *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker* (1912), which is in the public domain. They have been read from the page images themselves rather than from any digital transcription, because the automated text of a polytonic page cannot be trusted. Every translation is new and independent; no modern translation has been consulted.

Where a Diels number gathers more than one witness — and well over half of them do; A 81 carries nine — each witness is named above its own text on both pages of every opening, in the same words and the same order, so that a reader never has to look across to learn who is speaking. Where the witnesses on one number are not of the same standing, the note says which is which.

Square brackets in the Greek mark words Diels deleted; angle brackets mark words he supplied. The apparatus in small type records only those readings that bear on the sense of the translation, and gives them in English rather than in the Latin of the critical tradition.

Two numbers are long enough to be books in themselves — A 1, the *Life*, and A 86, the chapter of Theophrastus — and each is printed in editorial groups, so that the commentary stands beside the section it discusses. The section numbers within them are the ancient ones and run unbroken; the groupings are this edition's.

The order is Diels's throughout, which is not thematic and is sometimes inconvenient. It has been kept because a reader who wants to check this book against another edition, or against Diels himself, should be able to do so without a concordance.

Finally: this is a volume of disagreements, and a reader who finds them irritating has understood the material. Nothing here is Empedocles' own voice. What is here is fifty-two people, most of whom never met, arguing across nine centuries about a man whose book they had and we do not.

HOW TO READ THIS VOLUME

Nothing in this book is Empedocles' own words. Volume I holds those. What stands here is what other people said he said — and the distance between those two things is the whole reason for the volume.

The witnesses are not of equal weight, and the first thing to know is how they differ.

Aristotle wrote roughly a century after Empedocles died, with the poem in front of him, and argued with it directly. He is the best witness we have and the most treacherous, because he restates Empedocles in his own vocabulary as he goes. Where he writes *elements*, Empedocles wrote *roots*. Where he speaks of *matter*, Empedocles had no such category. His reports and his objections run together in the same sentence, and the notes here mark the seam wherever it falls. Two works printed under his name are not his: the *Problems* at A 69 and *On Breath* at A 78 are school compilations, and are marked Pseudo-Aristotle throughout.

Theophrastus, Aristotle's successor at the Lyceum, wrote the first history of a philosophical problem that anyone wrote, and almost everything later is downstream of him. The third part of this volume is his chapter on Empedocles entire.

Aëtius is a different order of evidence again — and he is, strictly, a reconstruction. No manuscript of Aëtius survives. Diels assembled him in 1879 out of two later compilations that plainly drew on a common source, and the name is his hypothesis. What we read as an Aëtius notice is therefore a modern reconstruction of a lost epitome of a lost handbook that itself compressed Theophrastus. It is often a single sentence, stripped of argument. It should never be weighed against Aristotle as though the two were the same kind of thing.

Simplicius wrote in the sixth century AD and still had substantial portions of the poem; he quotes at length and cites book numbers. He is invaluable, and he is a Neoplatonist reading a Presocratic, which shows.

Hippolytus, Plutarch, Philo, Galen, Soranus, Censorinus, Seneca and the rest each had their own reasons for mentioning Empedocles — apologetic, medical, astronomical, polemical — and those reasons shaped what they preserved. At the far end of the range stands *On Plants*, quoted at A 70, which reached Latin through Syriac and Arabic and calls Empedocles by a name no Greek would recognise.

Where a Diels number gathers more than one witness — and more than half of them do — each witness is named above its own text on both pages of the opening, in the same words and the same order, so that it is never necessary to look across to learn who is speaking. Where the witnesses on one number are of unequal worth, the note says so.

Square brackets in the Greek mark words Diels deleted; angle brackets mark words he supplied. The apparatus in small type records only the readings that bear on the sense of the translation, and gives them in English.

A last caution. Several of the doctrines below appear in no surviving verse at all. That the roots lose their distinctness inside the Sphairos; that the heaven is frozen air; that there are two suns; that the cosmos is egg-shaped — for all of these, the testimony is the only evidence there is. They may be perfectly good report. They may also be later doctrine that drifted onto a famous name. Where a claim stands alone, the note says so.

WHAT IS IN THIS VOLUME

The Life (A 1 – A 25): Diogenes Laertius' Life entire, and the testimonia on the man — dates, teachers, politics, medicine, dress, the competing accounts of his death, and the question whether he was a poet.

The Doctrine: Principles, Cosmos and Cycle (A 26 – A 56): the roots, the two powers, mixture, the Sphairos, the cycle, and the making of the world.

The Doctrine, continued: Light, Sea, Plants and the Making of Bodies (A 57 – A 85): light, the heavens, weather, the sea, plants, the four generations of living things, and the physiology of the body.

Perception and Thought (A 86 – A 98): Theophrastus on how Empedocles thought seeing, hearing, smelling and thinking work, and thirteen sections taking the account apart; then pores, effluences, the lodestone, colour, appetite, and the soul.

Each part opens with a fuller note on what stands in it and what is disputed there.

Two parts remain to be added: a reception appendix, and the introduction, which will be written last.

CONTENTS

THE LIFE

Diogenes Laertius, and the Testimonia on the Man

A 1 §§ 51–52	<i>The family, and the two Empedocleses.....</i>	16
A 1 §§ 53–55	<i>A disputed father; the honey ox; and the Pythagorean law against...</i>	18
A 1 §§ 56–58	<i>Teachers, the burnt poems, the tragedies, and Gorgias.....</i>	22
A 1 §§ 59–60	<i>The sorcerer, the wind-stopper, and the woman who did not breathe</i>	26
A 1 §§ 61–63	<i>Thirty days without breath; the luxury of Acragas; the refused.....</i>	28
A 1 §§ 64–66	<i>The dinner that revealed a tyranny; Acron's tomb; the Thousand... 30</i>	
A 1 §§ 67–68	<i>Exile, Timon's lampoon, and the night he disappeared.....</i>	34
A 1 §§ 69–70	<i>The leap into Etna, the bronze sandal, and the rivers of Selinus.....</i>	38
A 1 §§ 71–72	<i>Timaeus demolishes the crater; the veiled statue.....</i>	40
A 1 §§ 73–74	<i>Purple, gold and bronze; a broken thigh; and how old he was.....</i>	42
A 1 §§ 76–77	<i>What he held, and how long the poems were.....</i>	46
A 2	<i>The Byzantine summary: the golden girdle, the crater, the Wind-stopper.....</i>	48
A 3	<i>Empedocles and the physicians of Sicily.....</i>	50
A 4	<i>Hippo refutes the doctrine that the soul is blood.....</i>	52
A 5	<i>Zeno wrote a commentary on him.....</i>	52
A 6	<i>Older in years, later in his work.....</i>	54
A 7	<i>A pupil of Parmenides, and more still of the Pythagoreans.....</i>	54
A 8–A 10	<i>The dates: three chronicles that do not agree.....</i>	56
A 11–A 12	<i>The ox of spices, and the Purifications recited at Olympia.....</i>	58
A 13–A 14	<i>The wind-stopper among the wonder-workers; and what he actually did.....</i>	60
A 15	<i>The lyre, the drawn sword, and the name of Pausanias.....</i>	62
A 16	<i>The bronze sandal, and Horace on the right to die.....</i>	64
A 17	<i>Among the melancholics.....</i>	66
A 18	<i>Purple and bronze, and a man walking the streets of Greece.....</i>	66
A 19	<i>The invention of rhetoric, and the line of descent.....</i>	68
A 20	<i>Two sayings.....</i>	70
A 21	<i>Lucretius on Sicily and on Empedocles.....</i>	72
A 22–A 23	<i>Is he a poet? Aristotle says no; the handbooks of hymn-writing say... 74</i>	
A 24–A 25	<i>The verdict of the handbooks.....</i>	76

THE DOCTRINE

Principles, Cosmos and Cycle

A 26	<i>Empedocles ranked among the masters of the "austere" mode of composition.</i>	82
A 27	<i>Cicero on Lucretius, and on the Latin Empedoclea of Sallustius.</i>	82
A 28	<i>The four roots as eternal and unchanging; Love and Strife as the moving...</i>	84
A 29	<i>The Ionian and Sicilian Muses; Empedocles' one-and-many against...</i>	86
A 30	<i>The cosmogony: the air poured round, the fire running out, the two...</i>	88
A 31	<i>The daimones; Strife and Love as principle; transmigration.</i>	90
A 32	<i>The One as spherical, eternal, unmoved; the elements as gods; the...</i>	92
A 33	<i>A third identification of the four divine names, with reasons given.</i>	92
A 34	<i>Mixture: the elements are unchanging, and compounds arise from them by...</i>	96
A 35	<i>The elements have no fixed places.</i>	96
A 36	<i>The four reduced to two.</i>	96
A 37	<i>The charge of inconsistency in the use of Love and Strife; the four as...</i>	98
A 38	<i>Love and Strife prevail by necessity and by turns, with rest between.</i>	100
A 39	<i>Why a second principle was needed: the presence of evil and disorder in...</i>	100
A 40	<i>The roots are prior to the god; Love separates as well as joins.</i>	102
A 41	<i>The Sphairos as without quality; the charge of self-contradiction.</i>	102
A 42	<i>Why Empedocles omits a cosmogony under Love.</i>	104
A 43	<i>Mixture by juxtaposition of small parts, not by fusion.</i>	106
A 44	<i>Coming-to-be and perishing are combination and separation, not...</i>	108
A 45	<i>Necessity, and its identification with Love and Strife.</i>	108
A 46	<i>Separation out of a mixture; the cycle as periodic, against Anaxagoras'...</i>	110
A 47	<i>The cosmos is one, but only a small part of the All.</i>	110
A 48	<i>The world by nature and chance, without mind, god or art.</i>	112
A 49	<i>The order of separation in the cosmogony.</i>	114
A 50	<i>The shape of the cosmos; the sun's circuit as its boundary.</i>	116
A 51	<i>The heaven as solid, crystalline, made of frozen air.</i>	118
A 52	<i>The destruction of the cosmos, and the alternation of the two cosmic.</i>	120
A 53	<i>The stars are fire squeezed out of the air.</i>	122
A 54	<i>Fixed stars bound to the crystal; the planets go free.</i>	122
A 55	<i>The moon as a fragment struck off the sun.</i>	122
A 56	<i>The two suns.</i>	124

THE DOCTRINE, CONTINUED

Light, Sea, Plants and the Making of Bodies

A 57	<i>Light travels, and takes time to travel.</i>	128
A 58	<i>The tilt of the heavens; the sun's turning.</i>	130
A 59	<i>Solar eclipse.</i>	130

A 60	<i>The moon — its matter, its shape, its borrowed light</i>	132
A 61	<i>The distance of the moon</i>	134
A 62	<i>Evil reaches as far as the moon</i>	134
A 63	<i>Lightning and thunder</i>	136
A 64	<i>Why the winds blow slantwise</i>	136
A 65	<i>Winter and summer</i>	138
A 66	<i>The sea: the sweat of the earth, and the fresh water in it</i>	138
A 67	<i>Why the earth stays where it is</i>	142
A 68	<i>Fires under the earth, and hot springs</i>	144
A 69	<i>How stone is made</i>	146
A 69a	<i>White and black</i>	148
A 70	<i>Plants — the first living things</i>	150
A 71	<i>Medicine and the study of nature</i>	154
A 72	<i>The four generations of living things</i>	156
A 73	<i>Why the hottest animals live in water</i>	158
A 74	<i>The first breath, and how breathing works now</i>	160
A 75	<i>Why both ten-month and seven-month children live</i>	162
A 76	<i>Socrates recalls the questions of natural philosophy</i>	164
A 77	<i>Nourishment, growth, and digestion</i>	166
A 78	<i>Flesh, sinew, bone — the doctrine of ratio</i>	168
A 79	<i>The vessels of the navel</i>	170
A 80	<i>Menstruation and the moon</i>	172
A 81	<i>The generation of male and female, monsters, twins, and likeness</i>	174
A 82	<i>Why mules are barren</i>	180
A 83	<i>How long the embryo takes to form</i>	182
A 84	<i>The heart forms first</i>	184
A 85	<i>Sleep and death</i>	184

PERCEPTION AND THOUGHT

Theophrastus on the Senses; Pores, Effluences and the Soul

A 86 §§ 1–2	<i>Theophrastus places Empedocles among those who explain perception</i>	188
A 86 §§ 7–8	<i>Sight: fire within, the alternating passages, and why some</i>	190
A 86 § 9	<i>Hearing, smell, taste and touch</i>	194
A 86 §§ 10–11	<i>Thought is in the blood, and character follows the blend</i>	196
A 86 §§ 12–13	<i>The first objections: what separates the living from the</i>	198
A 86 §§ 14–15	<i>Fitting, touching, and whether likeness is doing any work at all</i> 200	
A 86 §§ 16–17	<i>Pleasure and pain; and the colours that are neither white nor</i> ... 202	

A 86 §§ 18–19 <i>Day and night vision again; and how the other senses could judge.....</i>	204
A 86 §§ 20–21 <i>Effluence, and what it cannot explain.....</i>	206
A 86 §§ 22–23 <i>Breathing is not the cause of smell; and the trouble with.....</i>	210
A 86 § 24 <i>The last objection: an organ is an instrument, not a cause.....</i>	212
A 87 <i>Pores and solid parts, and whether a pore is a void.....</i>	214
A 88 <i>Images in a mirror.....</i>	216
A 89 <i>Why the lodestone draws iron — and four objections to the answer.....</i>	218
A 90 <i>Rays or images?.....</i>	222
A 91 <i>Fire in the eye, and why grey eyes and dark eyes differ.....</i>	224
A 92 <i>Colour is an effluence commensurate with sight.....</i>	226
A 93 <i>The bell inside the ear.....</i>	228
A 94 <i>Smell comes in with the breath; and whether water has flavours in it.....</i>	228
A 95 <i>Appetite is a lack; pleasure is a like meeting a like.....</i>	230
A 96 <i>Mind and soul are the same, so no animal is irrational.....</i>	232
A 97 <i>Where the governing part is.....</i>	232
A 98 <i>Two kinds of madness.....</i>	234

THE LIFE

Diogenes Laertius, and the Testimonia on the Man

Diels-Kranz 31 A 1 – A 25

The man: his family and dates, his teachers, his politics, his medicine, his dress, the four or five accounts of his death, and the ancient argument over whether what he wrote was poetry.

A 1 is not a notice but a book — the whole of Diogenes Laertius' Life, and a compilation rather than a biography. Its value is that Diogenes names his authorities and lets them disagree: six of them in the first twelve lines, four different names for the father, three ages at death, and five deaths. Where he adjudicates, he does it on evidence, and the chronology he takes from Apollodorus still stands.

The best thing in it is at §§ 71 and 72, where Timaeus of Tauromenium takes apart the story of the leap into Etna with arguments a modern historian would make: the host's estate was in the wrong city, the friend who supposedly witnessed a deification put up no monument and could well afford one, and Empedocles, who wrote at length about fire, never once mentions the volcano. The story survives anyway, because it is a good ending, and by Horace's time it had become a joke in a handbook of literary manners.

What is not in dispute is smaller and more interesting: the purple robe and bronze shoes, attested by four unconnected witnesses; the bloodless ox of honey or of spices, sacrificed by a man who held that killing was murder; the hides or the wall that stopped a sickly wind, and the two rivers he diverted at his own expense to end a plague at Selinus; and the tally at § 77, which says the two poems ran to five thousand lines. Volume I of this edition prints four hundred and eighty-four.

A 1 §§ 51-52

DIOGENES LAERTIUS VIII 51

Ἐμπεδοκλῆς, ὥς φησιν Ἰππόβοτος, Μέτωνος ἦν υἱὸς τοῦ Ἐμπεδοκλέους Ἀκραγαντίνος. τὸ δ' αὐτὸ καὶ Τίμαιος ἐν τῇ πεντεκαίδεκάτῃ τῶν Ἱστοριῶν (λέγει προσιστορῶν) ἐπίσημον ἄνδρα γεγονέναι τὸν Ἐμπεδοκλέα τὸν πάππον τοῦ ποιητοῦ. ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἑρμιππος τὰ αὐτὰ τούτῳ φησίν. ὁμοίως Ἡρακλείδης ἐν τῷ Περὶ νόσων, ὅτι λαμπρᾶς ἦν οἰκίας ἵπποτροφικότος τοῦ πάππου. λέγει δὲ καὶ Ἐρατοσθένης ἐν τοῖς Ὀλυμπιονίκαις τὴν πρώτην καὶ ἑβδομηκοστὴν ὀλυμπιάδα νενικηκέναι τὸν τοῦ Μέτωνος πατέρα, μάρτυρι χρώμενος Ἀριστοτέλει.

DIOGENES LAERTIUS VIII 52

Ἀπολλόδωρος δ' ὁ γραμματικὸς ἐν τοῖς Χρονικοῖς φησιν ὥς ἦν μὲν Μέτωνος υἱός, εἰς δὲ Θουρίους αὐτὸν νεωστὶ παντελῶς ἐκτισμένους (ὁ) Γλαῦκος ἐλθεῖν φησιν. εἴθ' ὑποβάς· οἱ δ' ἱστοροῦντες, ὥς πεφευγὼς οἴκοθεν εἰς τὰς Συρακούσας μετ' ἐκείνων ἐπολέμει πρὸς Ἀθηναίους, ἐμοὶ (γε) τελέως ἀγνοεῖν δοκοῦσιν· ἢ γὰρ οὐκέτ' ἦν ἢ παντελῶς υπεργεγνηρακῶς, ὅπερ οὐχὶ φαίνεται. Ἀριστοτέλης γὰρ αὐτόν, ἔτι τε Ἡρακλείδης, ἐξήκοντα ἐτῶν φησι τετελευτηκέναι. ὁ δὲ (τὴν) μίαν καὶ ἑβδομηκοστὴν ὀλυμπιάδα νενικηκῶς κέλῃτι τούτου πάππος ἦν ὁμώνυμος, ὥσθ' ἅμα καὶ τὸν χρόνον ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀπολλοδώρου σημαίνεσθαι.

A 1 §§ 51-52

The family, and the two Empedocleses

DIOGENES LAERTIUS VIII 51

Empedocles, as Hippobotus says, was the son of Meton, the son of Empedocles, and a man of Acragas. Timaeus says the same in the fifteenth book of his Histories, recording besides that Empedocles the grandfather of the poet had been a man of distinction. Hermippus says the same as he does; and so does Heraclides in his On Diseases — that the house was a brilliant one, the grandfather having kept racehorses. Eratosthenes says in his Olympic Victors that the father of Meton won in the seventy-first Olympiad, and cites Aristotle as his authority.

DIOGENES LAERTIUS VIII 52

Apollodorus the grammarian says in his Chronicles that "he was the son of Meton, and Glaucus says that he went to Thurii, then only just founded." And then, further down: "Those who record that he fled from home to Syracuse and made war alongside them against the Athenians seem to me wholly ignorant. For by then he was either no longer alive, or extremely old — which does not appear to be so." For Aristotle, and Heraclides besides, says that he died at sixty. And the man who won with the single horse in the seventy-first Olympiad "was this man's grandfather, of the same name," so that the date is indicated at the same time by Apollodorus.

Biography, compiled in the third century AD from sources four centuries older.

Diogenes is not a biographer but a compiler, and this is what a compilation looks like from the inside: six named authorities in twelve lines, two of them in verse, and the compiler adjudicating between them. The point at issue is real. The grandfather and the grandson bore the same name, and an Olympic victory recorded for "Empedocles" in 496 BC belongs to the elder; anyone who assigned it to the philosopher would have to make him a century old. Apollodorus saw this and said so, and the chronology of Empedocles' life still rests on his argument.

Bearing on Volume I. Fixes the date: born about 492 BC, dead at sixty.

8 {ὁ} Cobet. — 10 οἱ δ' ἰστοροῦντες, and the transposition of the verses, follow Clinton. — 12 πρὸς ... δοκοῦσιν Diels: the manuscripts read πρὸς τοὺς Αθηναίους τελέως ἀγνοεῖν μοι δοκοῦσιν. — 14 οὐχί Clinton: οὐ in the manuscripts. — 16 {τήν} Cobet. — 17 πάππος Karsten: πάντως in the manuscripts.

A 1 §§ 53–55

DIOGENES LAERTIUS VIII 53

Σάτυρος δὲ ἐν τοῖς Βίοις φησὶν, ὅτι Ἐμπεδοκλῆς υἱὸς μὲν ἦν Ἐξαίνετον, κατέλιπε δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς υἱὸν Ἐξαίνετον· ἐπὶ τε τῆς αὐτῆς Ὀλυμπιάδος τὸν μὲν ἵππῳ κέλητι νενικηκέναι, τὸν δὲ υἱὸν αὐτοῦ πάλῃ ἢ, ὥς Ἡρακλείδης ἐν τῇ Ἐπιτομῇ, δρόμῳ. ἐγὼ δὲ εὗρον ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασι Φαβωρίνου ὅτι καὶ βούν ἔθυσε τοῖς θεωροῖς ὁ Ἐμπεδοκλῆς ἐκ μέλιτος καὶ ἀλφίτων, καὶ ἀδελφὸν ἔσχε Καλλικρατίδην. Τηλαύγης δ' ὁ Πυθαγόρου παῖς ἐν τῇ πρὸς Φιλόλαον ἐπιστολῇ φησι τὸν Ἐμπεδοκλέα Ἀρχινόμου εἶναι υἱόν.

DIOGENES LAERTIUS VIII 54

ὅτι δ' ἦν Ἀκραγαντῖνος ἐκ Σικελίας αὐτὸς ἐναρχόμενος τῶν Καθαρμῶν φησιν· ὧ ... πόλεος, καὶ τὰ μὲν περὶ τοῦ γένους αὐτοῦ τάδε. ἀκοῦσαι δ' αὐτὸν Πυθαγόρου Τίμαιος διὰ τῆς ἐνάτης ἱστορεῖ, λέγων ὅτι καταγνωσθεὶς ἐπὶ λογοκλοπίαι τότε, καθὰ καὶ Πλάτων, τῶν λόγων ἐκωλύθη μετέχειν. μεμνησθαι δὲ καὶ αὐτὸν Πυθαγόρου λέγοντα· ἦν ... πλοῦτον. οἱ δὲ τοῦτο εἰς Παρμενίδην αὐτὸν λέγειν ἀναφέροντα.

A 1 §§ 53-55

A disputed father; the honey ox; and the Pythagorean law against poets

DIOGENES LAERTIUS VIII 53

Satyrus in his Lives says that Empedocles was the son of Exaenetus, and himself left a son named Exaenetus; and that in the same Olympiad the one won with the racehorse and his son in wrestling — or, as Heraclides says in his Epitome, in the foot-race. I myself found, in the memoirs of Favorinus, that Empedocles sacrificed an ox to the sacred envoys made out of honey and barley-meal, and that he had a brother Callicratides. Telauges the son of Pythagoras says, in his letter to Philolaus, that Empedocles was the son of Archinomus.

DIOGENES LAERTIUS VIII 54

That he was a man of Acragas in Sicily he says himself at the opening of the Purifications: "O friends ... city." So much for his family. Timaeus records in his ninth book that he heard Pythagoras, saying that he was convicted at that time of stealing discourses and — like Plato — was barred from sharing in them. And that he mentions Pythagoras himself when he says: "There was among them a man ... wealth." Others refer that passage to Parmenides instead.

A 1 §§ 53–55 (continued)

DIOGENES LAERTIUS VIII 55

φησὶ δὲ Νεάνθης ὅτι μέχρι Φιλολάου καὶ Ἐμπεδοκλέους ἐκοινώνουν οἱ Πυθαγορικοὶ τῶν λόγων. ἐπεὶ δ' αὐτὸς διὰ τῆς ποιήσεως ἐδημοσίωσεν αὐτά, νόμον ἔθεντο μηδενὶ μεταδῶσιν ἐποποιῶν· τὸ δ' αὐτὸ καὶ Πλάτωνα παθεῖν φησι· καὶ γὰρ τοῦτον κωλυθῆναι. τίνος μέντοι γε αὐτῶν ἤκουσεν ὁ Ἐμπεδοκλῆς, οὐκ εἶπε· τὴν γὰρ περιφερομένην ὡς Τηλαύγους ἐπιστολὴν ὅτι τε μετέσχεν Ἰππάσου καὶ Βροτίνου, μὴ εἶναι ἀξιόπιστον. ὁ δὲ Θεόφραστος Παρμενίδου φησὶ ζηλωτὴν αὐτὸν γενέσθαι καὶ μιμητὴν ἐν τοῖς ποιήμασι· καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖνον ἐν ἔπεσι τὸν περὶ φύσεως ἐξενεγκεῖν λόγον.

A 1 §§ 53–55 (continued)

DIOGENES LAERTIUS VIII 55

Neanthes says that down to Philolaus and Empedocles the Pythagoreans shared their discourses freely; but when Empedocles made them public in his poem they laid down a law that they should be imparted to no epic poet. He says that Plato suffered the same, for he too was barred. But which of them Empedocles studied under, Neanthes did not say — for the letter that circulates as Telauges', saying that he had been a pupil of Hippasus and Brotinus, is not to be trusted. Theophrastus says that he was an emulator of Parmenides, and an imitator of him in his poems, since Parmenides too had brought out his account of nature in epic verse.

Biography, with four incompatible accounts of the family and one of the quarrel.

Four authorities give the father four different names — Meton, Exaenetus, Archinomos — and Diogenes reports them all without deciding. Two things here are worth more than the genealogy. The first is the ox of honey and barley-meal: a man who held that all killing was murder still had to make a public sacrifice, and made one that spilled no blood. The second is Neanthes' law. Whether or not the Pythagoreans really passed it, the tradition understood perfectly what Empedocles had done — he put into hexameters, for anyone to read, what had been the property of a closed society. The charge of stealing discourses is the same charge in older language.

Bearing on Volume I. B 112 opens the Purifications; B 129 is the portrait of "a man of surpassing knowledge," Pythagoras or Parmenides.

19 Ἐμπεδοκλέους ... Ἐξαίνετος: Schwartz's correction; compare Eusebius, Chronicle I 204, and Diodorus XIII 82, 7. The quotations are fragments B 112 and B 129.

A 1 §§ 56–58

DIOGENES LAERTIUS VIII 56

Ἑρμιππος δὲ οὐ Παρμενίδου, Ξενοφάνους δὲ γεγονέναι ζηλωτήν, ὧι καὶ συνδιατρίψαι καὶ μιμήσασθαι τὴν ἐποποιίαν· ὕστερον δὲ τοῖς Πυθαγορικοῖς ἐντυχεῖν. Ἀλκιδάμας δ' ἐν τῷ Φυσικῷ φησι κατὰ τοὺς αὐτοὺς χρόνους Ζήνωνα καὶ Ἐμπεδοκλέα ἀκοῦσαι Παρμενίδου, εἶθ' ὕστερον ἀποχωρῆσαι, καὶ τὸν μὲν Ζήνωνα κατ' ἰδίαν φιλοσοφῆσαι, τὸν δὲ Ἀναξαγόρου διακοῦσαι καὶ Πυθαγόρου· καὶ τοῦ μὲν τὴν σεμνότητα ζηλῶσαι τοῦ τε βίου καὶ τοῦ σχήματος, τοῦ δὲ τὴν φυσιολογίαν.

DIOGENES LAERTIUS VIII 57

Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ ἐν τῷ Σοφιστῇ φησι πρῶτον Ἐμπεδοκλέα ῥητορικὴν εὐρεῖν, Ζήνωνα δὲ διαλεκτικὴν. ἐν δὲ τῷ Περὶ ποιητῶν φησιν ὅτι καὶ Ὀμηρικὸς ὁ Ἐμπεδοκλῆς καὶ δεινὸς περὶ τὴν φράσιν γέγονεν, μεταφορητικός τε ὢν καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς περὶ ποιητικὴν ἐπιτεύγμασι χρώμενος· καὶ διότι γράψαντος αὐτοῦ καὶ ἄλλα ποιήματα τὴν τε Ξέρξου διάβασιν καὶ προοίμιον εἰς Ἀπόλλωνα, ταῦθ' ὕστερον κατέκαυσέν τις αὐτοῦ ἢ θυγάτηρ, ὥς φησιν Ἰερώνυμος, τὸ μὲν προοίμιον ἄκουσα, τὰ δὲ Περσικὰ βουληθεῖσα διὰ τὸ ἀτελείωτα εἶναι.

A 1 §§ 56–58

Teachers, the burnt poems, the tragedies, and Gorgias

DIOGENES LAERTIUS VIII 56

Hermippus says he was an emulator not of Parmenides but of Xenophanes, with whom he spent time and whose epic manner he imitated, and that he fell in with the Pythagoreans later. Alcidamas says in his *Physics* that Zeno and Empedocles heard Parmenides at the same period and afterwards went their own ways: Zeno to philosophise on his own, Empedocles to study under Anaxagoras and Pythagoras — emulating in the one the gravity of his life and his bearing, and in the other his natural philosophy.

DIOGENES LAERTIUS VIII 57

Aristotle says in the *Sophist* that Empedocles was the first to discover rhetoric, and Zeno dialectic. And in the *On Poets* he says that Empedocles was Homeric and formidable in his diction, given to metaphor and employing all the other resources of the poetic art; and that, since he had written other poems besides — a *Crossing of Xerxes* and a prelude to *Apollo* — these were afterwards burnt by a sister of his, or a daughter, as Hieronymus says: the prelude by accident, the Persian poem on purpose, because it was unfinished.

A 1 §§ 56–58 (continued)

DIOGENES LAERTIUS VIII 58

καθόλου δέ φησι καὶ τραγωιδίας αὐτὸν γράψαι καὶ πολιτικούς· Ἡρακλείδης δὲ ὁ τοῦ Σαραπίωνος ἐτέρου φησὶν εἶναι τὰς τραγωιδίας. Ἰερώνυμος δὲ τρισὶ καὶ τετταράκοντά φησιν ἐντετυχηκέναι, Νεάνθης δὲ νέον ὄντα γεγραμέναι τὰς τραγωιδίας καὶ αὐτῶν ἑπτὰ ἐντετυχηκέναι. φησὶ δὲ Σάτυρος ἐν τοῖς Βίοις, ὅτι καὶ ἱατρός ἦν καὶ ῥήτωρ ἄριστος. Γοργίαν γοῦν τὸν Λεοντῖνον αὐτοῦ γενέσθαι μαθητήν, ἄνδρα ὑπερέχοντα ἐν ῥητορικῇ καὶ τέχνην ἀπολελοιπότα· ὃν φησιν Ἀπολλόδωρος ἐν Χρονικοῖς ἐννέα πρὸς τοῖς ἑκατὸν ἔτη βιώσασθαι.

A 1 §§ 56–58 (continued)

DIOGENES LAERTIUS VIII 58

In general he says that Empedocles wrote tragedies as well, and political speeches. Heraclides the son of Sarapion says the tragedies are by another man. Hieronymus says he came upon forty-three of them; Neanthes, that Empedocles wrote the tragedies as a young man, and that he had come upon seven. Satyrus says in his Lives that he was also a physician and a first-rate orator: Gorgias of Leontini at any rate was his pupil, a man supreme in rhetoric who left a treatise behind him — and Apollodorus says in his Chronicles that Gorgias lived a hundred and nine years.

Biography, with Aristotle twice as the source.

Two claims here are usually passed over too quickly. That Empedocles invented rhetoric is Aristotle's, not a late fancy, and it is made in the same breath as the claim that Zeno invented dialectic — a pairing which says that the two arts were felt to arrive together, out of the same generation and the same part of the Greek world. And Gorgias was his pupil: the man who taught Greece that language could be made to do anything learnt it from a hexameter poet in Sicily. The burnt poems are the one place where we can see what has been lost as a definite thing rather than a general loss.

14 μεταφορητικός in BP: μεταφορικός in P²F; Aristotle in any case wrote the latter. — 21 αὐτῶν ἐπτά Diels: αὐτὸν ἔπειτα in the manuscripts.

A 1 §§ 59–60

DIOGENES LAERTIUS VIII 59

τοῦτόν φησιν ὁ Σάτυρος λέγειν, ὡς αὐτὸς παρείη τῷ Ἐμπεδοκλεῖ γοητεύοντι. ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸν διὰ τῶν ποιημάτων ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι τοῦτό τε καὶ ἄλλα πλείω, δι' ὧν φησι· φάρμακα ... ἀνδρός.

DIOGENES LAERTIUS VIII 60

φησὶ δὲ καὶ Τίμαιος ἐν τῇ ὀκτωκαιδεκάτῃ κατὰ πολλοὺς τρόπους τεθαυμάσθαι τὸν ἄνδρα. καὶ γὰρ ἐτησίων ποτὲ σφοδρῶς πνευσάντων ὡς τοὺς καρποὺς λυμῆναι, κελεύσας ὄνους ἐκδαρῆναι καὶ ἀσκοὺς ποιῆσαι περὶ τοὺς λόφους καὶ τὰς ἀκρωρείας διέτεινε πρὸς τὸ συλλαβεῖν τὸ πνεῦμα· λήξαντος δὲ κωλυσανέμαν κληθῆναι. Ἡρακλείδης τε ἐν τῷ Περὶ νόσων φησὶ καὶ Πausανίαι ὑφηγήσασθαι αὐτὸν τὰ περὶ τὴν ἄπνουν. ἦν δ' ὁ Pausanίας, ὡς φησιν Ἀρίστιππος καὶ Σάτυρος, ἐρώμενος αὐτοῦ, ὧι δὴ καὶ τὰ Περὶ φύσεως προσπεφώνηκεν οὕτως· Pausanίη ...

A 1 §§ 59–60

The sorcerer, the wind-stopper, and the woman who did not breathe

DIOGENES LAERTIUS VIII 59

Satyrus says that Gorgias used to say he had himself been present when Empedocles was working sorcery; and that Empedocles professed this and much besides in his poems, where he says: "drugs ... of a man."

DIOGENES LAERTIUS VIII 60

Timaeus says in his eighteenth book that the man was marvelled at in many ways. Once, when the Etesian winds blew so violently as to ruin the crops, he ordered asses to be flayed and bags made of the hides, and stretched them about the hills and headlands to catch the wind; and when it dropped he was called Wind-stopper. Heraclides says in his *On Diseases* that he also instructed Pausanias in the case of the woman who did not breathe. Pausanias, as Aristippus and Satyrus say, was his beloved — the man to whom he dedicated the *On Nature* in these words: "Pausanias ..."

Biography; the point where the Life turns toward the marvellous.

The wind-stopping is the best-attested of the marvels, and it has a rational shape under the legend: hides strung across a mountain pass are a windbreak, and the epithet the town gave him is the sort of thing a town gives a man who has actually done something. The woman who did not breathe belongs with A 74 and B 100 — a case of suspended respiration, taught to a pupil as a case, which is what a physician does. B 111, quoted here, is the fragment where Empedocles promises control of wind and rain and the raising of the dead, so the biographers were not inventing the claim; they were repeating it.

Bearing on Volume I. B 1 dedicates the poem to Pausanias; B 111 promises the powers this section illustrates.

29 ἦν corrected by Beloch; the manuscripts of Diogenes read ὥς ἔν. — 32 Κωλυσανέμου, the form in the Suda. The quotations are fragments B 111 and B 1.

A 1 §§ 61-63

DIOGENES LAERTIUS VIII 61

ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπίγραμμα εἰς αὐτὸν ἐποίησεν· Παισανίην ... ἀδύτων. τὴν γοῦν ἄπνουν ὁ Ἡρακλείδης φησὶ τοιοῦτόν τι εἶναι, ὥς τριάκοντα ἡμέρας συντηρεῖν ἄπνουν καὶ ἄσφυκτον τὸ σῶμα· ὅθεν εἶπεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἡτρὸν καὶ μάντιν, λαμβάνων ἅμα καὶ ἀπὸ τούτων τῶν στίχων· ὦ φίλοι ... βάζιν.

DIOGENES LAERTIUS VIII 63

μέγαν δὲ τὸν Ἀκράγαντα εἰπεῖν φησιν, ἐπεὶ μυριάδες αὐτὸν κατώικουν ὀγδοήκοντα· ὅθεν τὸν Ἐμπεδοκλέα εἰπεῖν τρυφόντων αὐτῶν· Ἀκραγαντῖνοι τρυφᾶσι μὲν ὥς αὔριον ἀποθανούμενοι, οἰκίας δὲ κατασκευάζονται ὥς πάντα τὸν χρόνον βιωσόμενοι. αὐτοὺς δὲ τούτους τοὺς Καθαρμοὺς Ὀλυμπίασι ῥαψωιδῆσαι λέγεται Κλεομένη τὸν ῥαψωιδόν, ὥς καὶ Φαβωρίνος ἐν Ἀπομνημονεύμασι. φησὶ δ' αὐτὸν καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης ἐλεύθερον γεγονέναι καὶ πάσης ἀρχῆς ἀλλότριον, εἴ γε τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτῷ διδομένην παρηιτήσατο, καθάπερ Ξάνθος ἐν τοῖς περὶ αὐτοῦ λέγει, τὴν λιτότητα δηλονότι πλέον ἀγαπήσας.

A 1 §§ 61–63

Thirty days without breath; the luxury of Acragas; the refused crown

DIODES LAERTIUS VIII 61

He also composed an epigram upon him: "Pausanias ... of the inner shrines." As for the breathless woman, Heraclides says the case was of this kind — that the body was kept thirty days without breath and without pulse. That is why he called Empedocles both physician and seer, taking the words at the same time from these verses of his: "O friends ... report."

DIODES LAERTIUS VIII 63

He says that Acragas was called great because eighty thousand people lived in it; whence Empedocles said, when they were living luxuriously: "The people of Acragas indulge themselves as though they would die tomorrow, and build their houses as though they would live for ever." These same Purifications are said to have been recited at Olympia by Cleomenes the rhapsode, as Favorinus too says in his Memoirs. And Aristotle says that Empedocles was a free man and a stranger to all office, since he refused the kingship when it was offered him — as Xanthus says in his account of him — plainly because he preferred a plain life.

Biography, with Aristotle cited for the refusal of kingship.

The two halves of this section are worth holding together, because the tradition did not separate them. The same man kept a woman thirty days without breath or pulse — a case, treated by a physician, which is what B 100 and A 74 are about — and was called a seer for it. The saying about Acragas is the best ancient sentence about that city and is very likely his. And the refusal of the crown is Aristotle's, not a later embellishment: it belongs with B 112, where he enters the towns garlanded and is followed by thousands, and declines to be anything but what he is.

Bearing on Volume I. B 112 opens the Purifications with the entry into Acragas; B 156 is the epigram to Pausanias.

3 ἄσφυκτον Mercurialis: ἄσπυτον in the manuscripts, ἄσιτον in the Suda. — 4 ἱητρόν in BP: ἱατρόν in P²F; compare B 146, 1. — 6 the words ποταμὸν ἄλλα in the text are the remains of an ancient marginal scholion. — 9 Ὀλυμπίαισι: the manuscripts vary between ἐν ὀλυμπιάδι and ἐν ὀλυμπίαι. The quotations are B 156 and B 112.

A 1 §§ 64–66

DIOGENES LAERTIUS VIII 64

τὰ δ' αὐτὰ καὶ Τίμαιος εἶρηκε, τὴν αἰτίαν ἅμα παρατιθέμενος τοῦ δημοτικὸν εἶναι τὸν ἄνδρα. φησὶ γὰρ ὅτι κληθεὶς ὑπὸ τινος τῶν ἀρχόντων, ὡς προβαίνοντος τοῦ δείπνου τὸ ποτὸν οὐκ εἰσεφέρετο, τῶν ἄλλων ἡσυχάζοντων, μισοπονήρως διατεθεὶς ἐκέλευσεν εἰσφέρειν· ὁ δὲ κεκληκὼς ἀναμένειν ἔφη τὸν τῆς βουλῆς ὑπηρετήν. ὡς δὲ παρεγένετο, ἐγενήθη συμποσίαρχος, τοῦ κεκληκὸτος δηλονότι καταστήσαντος, ὃς ὑπεγράφετο τυραννίδος ἀρχήν· ἐκέλευσε γὰρ ἢ πίνειν ἢ καταχεῖσθαι τῆς κεφαλῆς. τότε μὲν οὖν ὁ Ἐμπεδοκλῆς ἡσύχασε· τῇ δ' ὑστεραίᾳ εἰσαγαγὼν εἰς δικαστήριον ἀπέκτεινε καταδικάσας ἀμφοτέρους, τὸν τε κλήτορα καὶ τὸν συμποσίαρχον. ἀρχὴ μὲν οὖν αὐτῷ τῆς πολιτείας ἦδε.

DIOGENES LAERTIUS VIII 65

πάλιν δὲ Ἄκρωνος τοῦ ἱατροῦ τόπον αἰτοῦντος παρὰ τῆς βουλῆς εἰς κατασκευὴν πατρώιου μνήματος διὰ τὴν ἐν τοῖς ἱατροῖς ἀκρότητα παρελθὼν ὁ Ἐμπεδοκλῆς ἐκώλυσε, τὰ τε ἄλλα περὶ ἰσότητος διαλεχθεὶς καὶ τι καὶ τοιοῦτον ἐρωτήσας· τί δὲ ἐπιγράψομεν ἐλεγείον; ἢ τοῦτο· ἄκρον ... ἀκροτάτης; τινὲς δὲ τὸν δεύτερον στίχον οὕτω προφέρονται· ἀκροτάτης κορυφῆς τύμβος ἄκρος κατέχει. τοῦτό τινες Σιμωνίδου φασὶν εἶναι.

A 1 §§ 64–66

The dinner that revealed a tyranny; Acron's tomb; the Thousand dissolved

DIODEGENES LAERTIUS VIII 64

Timaeus says the same, and gives at the same time the reason why the man was on the people's side. He says that Empedocles was invited to dinner by one of the magistrates, and that as the meal went on no drink was brought in; the others kept quiet, but he, taking it ill, told them to bring it. His host said they were waiting for the servant of the council. When the man arrived he was made master of the feast — appointed, plainly, by the host — and he sketched out the beginnings of a tyranny: he ordered the guests either to drink or have the wine poured over their heads. Empedocles said nothing at the time; but the next day he brought both of them into court, the host and the master of the feast, secured their conviction and had them put to death. This was the beginning of his public life.

DIODEGENES LAERTIUS VIII 65

Again, when Acron the physician asked the council for a plot on which to build a monument to his father, on the strength of his pre-eminence among physicians, Empedocles came forward and blocked it. He argued at length about equality, and put among other things this question: "And what elegiac couplet shall we inscribe on it? This one? — 'The topmost ... of the topmost'?" Some quote the second line in this form instead: "the topmost tomb holds the topmost peak." Some say the couplet is by Simonides.

A 1 §§ 64–66 (continued)

DIOGENES LAERTIUS VIII 66

ὕστερον δ' ὁ Ἐμπεδοκλῆς καὶ τὸ τῶν χιλίων ἄθροισμα κατέλυσε συνεστῶς ἐπὶ ἔτη τρία, ὥστε οὐ μόνον ἦν τῶν πλουσίων, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν τὰ δημοτικὰ φρονούντων. ὁ γέ τοι Τίμαιος ἐν τῇ ια' καὶ ιβ', πολλάκις γὰρ αὐτοῦ μνημονεύει, φησὶν ἐναντίαν ἐσχηκέναι γνώμην αὐτὸν <ἐν> τε τῇ πολιτείαι <καὶ ἐν τῇ ποιήσει>. ὅπου μὲν γὰρ μέτριον καὶ ἐπιεικῇ φαίνεσθαι, ὅπου δὲ ἀλαζόνα καὶ φίλαυτον· φησὶ γοῦν· χαίρετ' ... πωλεῦμαι καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς.

A 1 §§ 64–66 (continued)

DIOGENES LAERTIUS VIII 66

Later Empedocles broke up the assembly of the Thousand, which had been in being for three years — so that he belonged not only to the rich but to those who were minded with the people. Timaeus at any rate, in his eleventh and twelfth books, for he mentions him often, says that Empedocles held opposite views in his politics and in his poetry: in the one he appears moderate and decent, in the other boastful and in love with himself. At any rate he says: "Farewell ... I go about" and what follows.

Biography, from Timaeus, who knew the Sicilian politics at first hand.

Timaeus is the strongest witness in the Life, a Sicilian historian writing within a century and a half, and his charge is precise: the man of the poems and the man of the assembly do not match. The politics is all levelling — a tyranny stopped at a dinner party, a rich physician refused a family monument on grounds of equality, an oligarchy of the Thousand dissolved. The poetry announces a god walking among mortals. Timaeus thought this a contradiction. It is at least as likely that a man who believed he had escaped the cycle of birth would take no interest in rank, and that the two are one position seen from two sides.

Bearing on Volume I. B 112, 4–5, the passage Timaeus takes as boastfulness, is the one place where the two halves of the corpus can be read against each other.

22 αὐτῶι Aldobrandinus: αὐτῇ, αὐτῇ and αὐτῇ in the manuscripts. — 29 χιλιάδων in F, διέλυσε in B. — 30 the numerals are Beloch's: the manuscripts read "first and second." — 32–33 the supplements are Diels's. The quotations are B 157 and B 112, 4–5.

A 1 §§ 67–68

DIOGENES LAERTIUS VIII 67

ὕστερον μέντοι τοῦ Ἀκράγαντος οἰκίζομένου ἀντέστησαν αὐτοῦ τῇ καθόδῳ οἱ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἀπόγονοι· διόπερ εἰς Πελοπόννησον ἀποχωρήσας ἐτελεύτησεν. οὐ παρῆκε δ' οὐδὲ τοῦτον ὁ Τίμων, ἀλλ' ὧδ' αὐτοῦ καθάπτεται λέγων· καὶ Ἐμπεδοκλῆς ἀγοραίων ληκητῆς ἐπέων· ὅσα δ' ἔσθενε, τοσσάδ' ἔειλεν, ἀρχῶν ὅς διέθηκ' ἀρχὰς ἐπιδευέας ἄλλων. περὶ δὲ τοῦ θανάτου διάφορός ἐστιν αὐτοῦ λόγος· Ἡρακλείδης μὲν γὰρ τὰ περὶ τῆς ἄπνου διηγησάμενος, ὡς ἐδοξάσθη Ἐμπεδοκλῆς ἀποστείλας τὴν νεκρὰν ἄνθρωπον ζῶσαν, φησὶν ὅτι θυσίαν συνετέλει πρὸς τῷ Πεισιάνακτος ἀγρῷ. συνεκέκληντο δὲ τῶν φίλων τινές, ἐν οἷς καὶ Παυσανίας.

A 1 §§ 67–68

Exile, Timon's lampoon, and the night he disappeared

DIOGENES LAERTIUS VIII 67

Later, however, when Acragas was being resettled, the descendants of his enemies opposed his return; and so he withdrew to the Peloponnese and died there. Timon did not let him off either, but attacks him in these words: "And Empedocles, a bawler of market-place verses; as many words as he had strength for, so many did he cram together — a man who laid down first principles that themselves stand in need of others." About his death the account varies. Heraclides, having told the story of the breathless woman — how Empedocles won glory by sending away as a living woman one who had been a corpse — says that he was performing a sacrifice at the field of Peisianax, and that some of his friends had been invited, Pausanias among them.

A 1 §§ 67–68 (continued)

DIOGENES LAERTIUS VIII 68

εἶτα μετὰ τὴν εὐωχίαν οἱ μὲν ἄλλοι χωρισθέντες ἀνεπαύοντο, οἱ μὲν ὑπὸ τοῖς δένδροις ὥς ἀγροῦ παρακειμένοι, οἱ δ' ὅπηι βούλονται, αὐτὸς δὲ ἔμεινεν ἐπὶ τοῦ τόπου ἐφ' οὗπερ κατεκέκλιτο. ὥς δὲ ἡμέρας γενηθείσης ἐξάνεστησαν, οὐχ ἠύρεθη μόνος. ζητουμένου δὲ καὶ τῶν οἰκετῶν ἀνακρινομένων καὶ φασκόντων μὴ εἰδέναι, εἷς τις ἔφη μέσων νυκτῶν φωνῆς ὑπερμεγέθους ἀκοῦσαι προσκαλουμένης Ἐμπεδοκλέα, εἶτα ἐξαναστὰς ἑώρακέναι φῶς οὐράνιον καὶ λαμπάδων φέγγος, ἄλλο δὲ μηδέν· τῶν δὲ ἐπὶ τῷ γενομένῳ ἐκπλαγέντων καταβὰς ὁ Πausanías ἔπεμψε τινὰς ζητήσοντας. ὕστερον δὲ ἐκώλυεν πολυπραγμονεῖν, φάσκων εὐχῆς ἄξια συμβεβηκέναι καὶ θύειν αὐτῷ δεῖν καθαπερεὶ γεγονότι θεῷ.

A 1 §§ 67–68 (continued)

DIOGENES LAERTIUS VIII 68

Then, after the feasting, the rest withdrew and lay down to rest, some under the trees of the neighbouring field and others where they pleased, while he stayed in the place where he had been reclining. When day came and they got up, he alone was not found. They searched, and questioned the servants, who said they knew nothing; but one of them said that in the middle of the night he had heard an enormous voice calling Empedocles, and that he had got up and seen a light in the sky and a blaze of torches, and nothing more. The others were dumbfounded at what had happened, and Pausanias came down and sent men to search. Afterwards he stopped them from enquiring further, saying that what had happened was an answer to prayer, and that they must sacrifice to Empedocles as to one who had become a god.

Biography; the first and fullest of the death stories.

Timon's hexameters are the earliest surviving joke about Empedocles and the only hostile contemporary voice in this volume. The charge is not that he was wrong but that he was grandiose and clotted — and the objection in the last line is a real one, that four principles which cannot move themselves need two more to move them. The death story that follows is the earliest and the most careful: no crater, no leap, only a voice, a light, and a man not there in the morning. Note who ends the enquiry. Pausanias, the pupil to whom the poem is addressed, forbids the search and calls for sacrifice.

Bearing on Volume I. The conclusion B 112 invites is drawn here by the one person best placed to draw it.

5 ἄλλως δ' in P². — 7 τοσσάδ' ἔειπεν is Diels's reading: τοσσάδε εἶπεν in the manuscripts; the sense is roughly "he packed together as many words as he could," a hit at ludicrous compounds such as the one at B 61. — 8 ἀρχῶν ὅς in the manuscripts; the sense in any case is that his principles, the four elements, require further principles, Love and Strife. — 15 ἡρέθη in P¹: εὔρεθη in the others.

A 1 §§ 69–70

DIOGENES LAERTIUS VIII 69

Ἑρμιππος δέ φησι Πάνθειάν τινα Ἀκραγαντίνην ἀπηλπισμένην ὑπὸ τῶν ἰατρῶν θεραπεῦσαι αὐτὸν καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τὴν θυσίαν ἐπιτελεῖν· τοὺς δὲ κληθέντας εἶναι πρὸς τοὺς ὀγδοήκοντα. Ἰππόβοτος δέ φησιν ἐξαναστάντα αὐτὸν ὠδευκέναι ὥς ἐπὶ τὴν Αἴτην, εἶτα παραγενόμενον ἐπὶ τοὺς κρατῆρας τοῦ πυρὸς ἐναλέσθαι καὶ ἀφανισθῆναι, βουλούμενον τὴν περὶ αὐτοῦ φήμην βεβαιῶσαι ὅτι γέγονοι θεός, ὕστερον δὲ γνωσθῆναι, ἀναρριπισθείσης αὐτοῦ μιᾶς τῶν κρηπίδων· χαλκᾶς γὰρ εἴθιστο ὑποδεῖσθαι. πρὸς τοῦθ' ὁ Πausανίας ἀντέλεγε.

DIOGENES LAERTIUS VIII 70

Διόδωρος δ' ὁ Ἐφέσιος περὶ Ἀναξιμάνδρου γράφων φησὶν ὅτι τοῦτον ἐξηλώκει, τραγικὸν ἄσκῶν τύπον καὶ σεμνὴν ἀναλαβὼν ἐσθῆτα. τοῖς Σελινουντίοις ἐμπεσόντος λοιμοῦ διὰ τὰς ἀπὸ τοῦ παρακειμένου ποταμοῦ δυσωδίας, ὥστε καὶ αὐτοὺς φθείρεσθαι καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας δυστοκεῖν, ἐπινοῆσαι τὸν Ἐμπεδοκλέα καὶ δύο τινὰς ποταμοὺς τῶν σύνεγγυς ἐπαγαγεῖν ἰδίαις δαπάναις· καὶ καταμίζαντα γλυκῆναι τὰ ρεύματα.

A 1 §§ 69–70

The leap into Etna, the bronze sandal, and the rivers of Selinus

DIOGENES LAERTIUS VIII 69

Hermippus says that he cured a woman of Acragas named Panthea, whom the physicians had given up, and that this was why he was holding the sacrifice; and that those invited numbered about eighty. Hippobotus says that he got up and made his way toward Etna, and that when he reached the craters of fire he leapt in and vanished, wishing to confirm the report about himself that he had become a god — but that he was found out later, when one of his sandals was thrown up by the fire, since he was in the habit of wearing bronze ones. Pausanias denied this story.

DIOGENES LAERTIUS VIII 70

Diodorus of Ephesus, writing about Anaximander, says that Empedocles emulated him, cultivating a tragic pomp and assuming solemn dress. — When a plague fell upon the people of Selinus through the foul air from the river beside the town, so that the people themselves were dying and the women miscarrying, Empedocles conceived a plan and brought in two of the neighbouring rivers at his own expense; and by mixing them he sweetened the waters.

Biography: three more deaths, and one piece of public engineering.

The leap into Etna is the story everyone knows, and it is the least well attested thing in this Life. It rests on Hippobotus, a late compiler; the bronze sandal thrown back out of the volcano is a detail from comedy rather than from history; and Pausanias, who was there, contradicted it. It survives because it is a good ending, and because a man who wrote B 112 invites it. The Selinus rivers are the opposite kind of report: a named town, a named disease, a named remedy paid for out of his own pocket — and the coins of Selinus struck in that period show a river-god sacrificing at an altar, which is as close to independent confirmation as this material ever comes.

20 ἐκώλυε Reiske: the manuscripts read ἐκωλύθη. — 26–27 γεγονόιν in B¹P¹: γεγόνει in F. — 28 Pausanias' denial comes in Heraclides' dialogue. — 31 on the plague at Selinus compare Head, Historia Numorum, pp. 147 ff.

A 1 §§ 71-72

DIODEGENES LAERTIUS VIII 70-71

οὕτω δὴ λήξαντος τοῦ λοιμοῦ καὶ τῶν Σελινουντίων εὐωχουμένων ποτὲ παρὰ τῷ ποταμῷ, ἐπιφανῆναι τὸν Ἐμπεδοκλέα· τοὺς δ' ἔξαναστάντας προσκυνεῖν καὶ προσεύχεσθαι καθάπερ εἰ θεῷ. ταύτην οὖν θέλοντα βεβαιῶσαι τὴν διάληψιν εἰς τὸ πῦρ ἐναλέσθαι. τούτοις δ' ἐναντιοῦται Τίμαιος ῥητῶς λέγων ὡς ἐξεχώρησεν εἰς Πελοπόννησον καὶ τὸ σύνολον οὐκ ἐπανῆλθεν· ὅθεν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν τελευτὴν ἄδηλον εἶναι.

DIODEGENES LAERTIUS VIII 71-72

πρὸς δὲ τὸν Ἡρακλείδην καὶ ἐξ ὀνόματος ποιεῖται τὴν ἀντίρρησιν ἐν τῇ ιδ'. Συρακόσιόν τε γὰρ εἶναι τὸν Πεισιάνακτα καὶ ἀγρὸν οὐκ ἔχειν ἐν Ἀκράγαντι· Πανσανίαν τε μνημεῖον <ἄν> πεποιηκέναι τοῦ φίλου, τοιοῦτου διαδοθέντος λόγου, ἢ ἀγαλμάτιόν τι ἢ σηκὸν οἶα θεοῦ· καὶ γὰρ πλούσιον εἶναι. πῶς οὖν, φησὶν, εἰς τοὺς κρατῆρας ἦλατο ὧν σύνεγγυς ὄντων οὐδὲ μνείαν ποτὲ ἐπεποίητο; τετελεύτηκεν οὖν ἐν Πελοποννήσῳ. οὐδὲν δὲ παράδοξον τάφον αὐτοῦ μὴ φαίνεσθαι· μηδὲ γὰρ ἄλλων πολλῶν. τοιαῦτά τινα εἰπὼν ὁ Τίμαιος ἐπιφέρει· ἀλλὰ διὰ παντός ἐστιν Ἡρακλείδης τοιοῦτος παραδοξολόγος, καὶ ἐκ τῆς σελήνης πεπτωκέναι ἄνθρωπον λέγων.

A 1 §§ 71-72

Timaeus demolishes the crater; the veiled statue

DIOGENES LAERTIUS VIII 70-71

And so, when the plague had ceased and the people of Selinus were once feasting beside the river, Empedocles appeared among them; and they rose and bowed down and prayed to him as to a god. It was to confirm this opinion of himself, then, that he leapt into the fire. — Timaeus contradicts all this, saying flatly that he withdrew to the Peloponnese and never came back at all, and that this is why his end is unknown.

DIOGENES LAERTIUS VIII 71-72

And he makes his refutation of Heraclides by name, in his fourteenth book. Peisianax, he says, was a Syracusan and had no field at Acragas at all; and had any such story got about, Pausanias would have made a memorial of his friend, some small statue or a shrine such as a god has — for he was a rich man. "How then," he says, "did he leap into the craters, which were close at hand and which he had never once so much as mentioned? He died, therefore, in the Peloponnese. And there is nothing strange in no tomb of his being visible; neither is there for a great many others." After saying something of this kind Timaeus adds: "But Heraclides is this sort of marvel-monger all through — he is the man who says that a human being fell out of the moon."

Biography, and the one place where an ancient historian cross-examines a source.

This is the most rigorous piece of source-criticism in the ancient literature on Empedocles, and it is worth reading closely, because every one of Timaeus' arguments is an argument a modern historian would make. The host's estate is in the wrong city. The friend who is supposed to have witnessed a deification put up no monument, and could have afforded one. And — the decisive point — Empedocles, who wrote about fire at enormous length, never once mentions Etna. Timaeus is not merely sceptical; he has read the poems and noticed what is not in them.

Bearing on Volume I. The volcano belongs to the legend, not to the evidence.

7 the book number is Diels's: the manuscripts read "fourth." — 8 {ὅν} C. Müller. — 12 μηδέ: Diels continues Timaeus' direct speech where the manuscripts pass into indirect. — 17 εἰκότως Sturz: εἰσὶ τιναί in the manuscripts.

A 1 §§ 73-74

DIOGENES LAERTIUS VIII 72-73

Νεάνθης δ' ὁ Κυζικηνὸς ὁ καὶ περὶ τῶν Πυθαγορικῶν εἰπὼν φησι
Μέτωνος τελευτήσαντος τυραννίδος ἀρχὴν ὑποφύεσθαι· εἴτα τὸν
Ἐμπεδοκλέα πείσαι τοὺς Ἀκραγαντίνους παύσασθαι μὲν τῶν
στάσεων, ἰσότητα δὲ πολιτικὴν ἀσκεῖν. ἔτι τε πολλὰς τῶν πολιτῶν
ἀπρόϊκους ὑπαρχούσας αὐτὸν προικίσαι διὰ τὸν παρόντα πλοῦτον·
διὸ δὴ πορφύραν τε ἀναλαβεῖν αὐτὸν καὶ στρόφιον ἐπιθέσθαι
χρυσοῦν, ὥς Φαβωρίνος ἐν Ἀπομνημονεύμασιν, ἔτι τ' ἐμβάτας
χαλκᾶς καὶ στέμμα Δελφικόν. κόμη τε ἦν αὐτῷ βαθεῖα καὶ παῖδες
ἀκόλουθοι· καὶ αὐτὸς αἰεὶ σκυθρωπὸς ἐφ' ἑνὸς σχήματος ἦν. τοιοῦτος
δὴ προήκει, τῶν πολιτῶν ἐντυχόντων καὶ τοῦτο ἀξιώσαντων οἰονεῖ
βασιλείας τινὸς παράσημον.

A 1 §§ 73–74

Purple, gold and bronze; a broken thigh; and how old he was

DIOGENES LAERTIUS VIII 72–73

Neanthes of Cyzicus, the same who wrote about the Pythagoreans, says that after the death of Meton the beginnings of a tyranny began to grow up, and that Empedocles then persuaded the people of Acragas to have done with faction and practise political equality. He also says that Empedocles provided dowries, out of the wealth he had, for many of the women of the city who had none; and that this was why he took to wearing purple and put on a golden girdle — so Favorinus says in his *Memoirs* — and bronze boots besides, and a Delphic wreath. His hair was worn long, and boys walked in attendance on him; and he himself was always grave, and kept one unvarying bearing. This was how he went about, and the citizens, meeting him, thought this fitting, as a kind of badge of royalty.

A 1 §§ 73–74 (continued)

DIOGENES LAERTIUS VIII 73–74

ὕστερον δὲ διὰ τινὰ πανήγυριν πορευόμενον ἐπ' ἀμάξης ὥς εἰς Μεσσήνην πεσεῖν καὶ τὸν μηρὸν κλάσαι· νοσήσαντα δ' ἐκ τούτου τελευτῆσαι ἐτῶν ἑπτὰ καὶ ἑβδομήκοντα. εἶναι δ' αὐτοῦ καὶ τάφον ἐν Μεγάροις. περὶ δὲ τῶν ἐτῶν Ἀριστοτέλης διαφέρεται· φησὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖνος ἐξήκοντα ἐτῶν αὐτὸν τελευτῆσαι. οἱ δὲ ἑννέα καὶ ἑκατόν. ἤκμαζε δὲ κατὰ τὴν τετάρτην καὶ ὀγδοηκοστήν Ὀλυμπιάδα. Δημήτριος δ' ὁ Τροιζήνιος ἐν τῷ Κατὰ σοφιστῶν βιβλίῳ φησὶν αὐτὸν καθ' Ὅμηρον ἀψάμενον βρόχον αἰπὺν ἄφ' ὑψηλοῦ κρανεῖης αὐχέν' ἀποκρεμάσαι, ψυχὴν <δ'> Αἰδόσδε κατελθεῖν. ἐν τῷ προειρημένῳ Τηλαύγους ἐπιστολίῳ λέγεται αὐτὸν εἰς θάλατταν ὑπὸ γήρως ὀλισθόντα τελευτῆσαι. καὶ ταῦτα μὲν περὶ τοῦ θανάτου καὶ τοσαῦτα.

A 1 §§ 73–74 (continued)

DIOGENES LAERTIUS VIII 73–74

Later, travelling to some festival on a wagon, on his way to Messene, he fell and broke his thigh; and falling ill from this he died at the age of seventy-seven. There is also a tomb of his at Megara. — About his years Aristotle differs, for he says that he died at sixty; others say at a hundred and nine. He was at his height in the eighty-fourth Olympiad. Demetrius of Troezen says in his book *Against the Sophists* that he, in Homer's words, "fastened a sheer noose from a lofty cornel tree and hanged his neck, and his soul went down to Hades." And in the little letter of Telauges mentioned above it is said that he slipped into the sea through old age and so died. So much, and no more, about his death.

Biography; four incompatible deaths and three incompatible ages.

Five deaths are now on record — the voice and the light, the crater, the broken thigh, the noose, and the slip into the sea — together with ages of sixty, seventy-seven and a hundred and nine, and tombs at Megara and nowhere. Diogenes sets them down and does not choose. What the accounts have in common is more telling than what divides them: none of them is ordinary, and all of them were needed because the real answer, which Timaeus gives, is that nobody knew. The purple and the golden girdle, by contrast, are not in dispute at all, and are corroborated at A 2 and A 16.

Bearing on Volume I. The dress described here is the dress of the man speaking in B 112.

25 προσήμει in PΦ: προσείη in BF. — 31 Δημήτριος Stephanus: Δημόκριτος in BPF. — 34 {δ'} in P²; absent from BP¹F. — 36 όλισθήσαντα in FP².

A 1 §§ 76-77

DIOGENES LAERTIUS VIII 76

ἐδόκει δ' αὐτῷ τάδε· στοιχεῖα μὲν εἶναι τέτταρα, πῦρ, ὕδωρ, γῆν, ἀέρα· Φιλίαν τε ἥι συγκρίνεται καὶ Νεῖκος ὧι διακρίνεται. φησὶ δ' οὕτω· Ζεὺς ... βρότειον, Δία μὲν τὸ πῦρ λέγων, Ἥρην δὲ τὴν γῆν, Αἰδωνέα δὲ τὸν ἀέρα, Νῆστιν δὲ τὸ ὕδωρ. καὶ ταῦτα, φησὶν, ἀλλάττοντα ... λήγει, ὥς ἂν αἰδίου τῆς τοιαύτης διακοσμήσεως οὔσης· ἐπιφέρει γοῦν· ἄλλοτε ... ἔχθει.

DIOGENES LAERTIUS VIII 77

καὶ τὸν μὲν ἥλιόν φησι πυρὸς ἄθροισμα μέγα καὶ τῆς σελήνης μείζω· τὴν δὲ σελήνην δισκοειδῆ, αὐτὸν δὲ τὸν οὐρανὸν κρυσταλλοειδῆ. καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν παντοῖα εἶδη ζώων καὶ φυτῶν ἐνδύεσθαι· φησὶ γοῦν· ἤδη ... ἰχθύς. τὰ μὲν οὖν Περὶ φύσεως αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ Καθαρμοὶ εἰς ἔπη τείνουσι πεντακισχίλια, ὁ δὲ Ἰατρικὸς λόγος εἰς ἔπη ἑξακόσια. περὶ δὲ τῶν τραγωιδιῶν προειρήκαμεν.

A 1 §§ 76–77

What he held, and how long the poems were

DIOGENES LAERTIUS VIII 76

These were his opinions. The elements are four — fire, water, earth, air — together with Love, by which they are combined, and Strife, by which they are separated. He puts it thus: "Zeus ... mortal," meaning by Zeus fire, by Hera earth, by Aidoneus air, and by Nestis water. "And these," he says, "continually changing ... never cease," the ordering being everlasting in this way; at any rate he goes on: "at one time ... in hatred."

DIOGENES LAERTIUS VIII 77

He says that the sun is a great mass of fire, and larger than the moon; that the moon is disc-shaped; and that the heaven itself is like crystal. And that the soul puts on all kinds of forms of animals and of plants — at any rate he says: "For already ... a fish." The *On Nature* and the *Purifications* together run to five thousand lines, and the *Medical Discourse* to six hundred. About the tragedies we have spoken already.

Doctrinal summary closing the Life, with the only ancient count of the lines.

Two things here are load-bearing for this edition. The first is the identification of the divine names. Diogenes makes Hera the earth and Aidoneus the air, and in doing so he sides with the Homeric Allegories and with Hippolytus against Aëtius, whose reversed pairing is what the modern handbooks print. With Diogenes counted, the ancient tally stands at three to one against the reading now in general use — see A 33, where the disagreement is set out in full. The second is the line count. Diogenes says five thousand lines for the two poems and six hundred for a Medical Discourse; Diels thought five thousand too many and would halve it. Either way, Volume I of this edition prints four hundred and eighty-four lines. That is the measure of what is gone: at best a tenth of it, and quite possibly a sixteenth.

Bearing on Volume I. The whole of Volume I is what survives of the five thousand lines counted here.

8 πεντακισχίλια: Diels judges the figure too large and would read "three thousand in all." The quotations are B 6, 2–3; B 17, 6; B 17, 7–8; and B 117.

A 2

THE SUDA

Ἐμπεδοκλῆς Μέτωνος, οἱ δὲ Ἀρχινόμου, οἱ δ' Ἐξαινέτου. καὶ ἀδελφὸν δὲ ἔσχε Καλλικρατίδην. ἠκροάσατο δὲ πρώτου Παρμενίδου, οὔτινος, ὥς φησι Πορφύριος ἐν τῇ Φιλοσόφων ἱστορίαι, καὶ ἐγένετο παιδικά. οἱ δὲ ἔφασαν μαθητὴν Τηλαύγου, τοῦ Πυθαγόρου υἱοῦ, τὸν Ἐμπεδοκλέα γενέσθαι. Ἀκραγαντῖνος δὲ φιλόσοφος φυσικὸς καὶ ἐποποιός. ἦν δὲ κατὰ τὴν οἴῳ Ὀλυμπιάδα.

THE SUDA

στέμμα ἔχων ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς χρυσοῦν καὶ ἀμύκλας ἐν τοῖς ποσὶ χαλκᾶς καὶ στέμματα Δελφικὰ ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν ἐπήκει τὰς πόλεις, δόξαν περὶ αὐτοῦ κατασχεῖν ὥς περὶ θεοῦ βουλόμενος. ἐπεὶ δὲ γηραιὸς ἐγένετο, νύκτωρ ἔρριψεν ἑαυτὸν εἰς κρατῆρα πυρός, ὥστε μὴ φανῆναι αὐτοῦ τὸ σῶμα. καὶ οὕτως ἀπώλετο τοῦ σανδαλίου αὐτοῦ ἐκβρασθέντος ὑπὸ τοῦ πυρός. ἐπεκλήθη δὲ καὶ κωλυσανέμας διὰ τὸ ἀνέμου πολλοῦ ἐπιφερομένου τῇ Ἀκράγαντι ἐξελάσαι αὐτὸν δορὰς ὄνων περιθέντα τῇ πόλει. γέγονε δὲ τούτου μαθητὴς Γοργίας ὁ ῥήτωρ ὁ Λεοντῖνος. καὶ ἔγραψε δι' ἐπῶν Περὶ φύσεως τῶν ὄντων βιβλία β', καὶ ἔστιν ἔπη ὡς δισχίλια, Ἰατρικὰ καταλογάδην καὶ ἄλλα πολλά.

A 2

The Byzantine summary: the golden girdle, the crater, the Wind-stopper

THE SUDA

Empedocles, son of Meton — others say of Archinomos, others of Exaenetus. He had a brother Callicratides. He first studied under Parmenides, whose beloved he became, as Porphyry says in his *History of Philosophers*. Others said that Empedocles was a pupil of Telauges the son of Pythagoras. He was a man of Acragas, a natural philosopher and an epic poet, and lived about the seventy-ninth Olympiad.

THE SUDA

With a golden wreath upon his head, and bronze shoes on his feet, and Delphic garlands in his hands, he went about the cities, wishing to secure the opinion that he was a god. When he had grown old he threw himself by night into a crater of fire, so that his body should not be found; and so he perished, his sandal having been cast up by the fire. He was also given the name Wind-stopper, because when a great wind was coming down upon Acragas he drove it off by putting asses' hides round the city. Gorgias the orator of Leontini was his pupil. And he wrote in verse two books *On the Nature of Things* — about two thousand lines — and *Medical Writings* in prose, and much else.

Late compilation, drawing on Hesychius and Porphyry.

A thousand years after the event, and everything has hardened. The four possible fathers of A 1 have become a list; the disputed leap into Etna has become the fact of the matter; the asses' hides, which Timaeus placed on the hills, now ring the city. But two details survive that are not in Diogenes at all: the poem was in two books, and it ran to about two thousand lines — a figure much closer to what the fragments suggest than the five thousand of A 1 § 77.

*Bearing on Volume I. The two-book division of the *Περὶ φύσεως*, which Simplicius confirms by citing book numbers.*

*17 ὁ deleted by Diels: the manuscript VBE reads οὗτος ὁ 'Ε. — 25 the numeral is in the manuscripts; Demetrius Chalcondyles read "three." — 26 *Ἰατρικά*: the same work as the *Ἰατρικὸς λόγος* at A 1 § 77.*

A 3

PLINY, NATURAL HISTORY

alia factio, ab experimentis cognominant empiricen, coepit in Sicilia, Acrone Agragantino Empedoclis physici auctoritate commendato.

THE SUDA, UNDER "ACRON"

Ἄκρων, Ἀκραγαντίνος υἱὸς Ξένωνος. ἐσοφίστευσεν ἐν ταῖς Ἀθήναις ἅμα Ἐμπεδοκλεῖ. ἔστιν οὖν πρεσβύτερος Ἱπποκράτους. ἔγραψε Περὶ ἰατρικῆς δωρίδι διαλέκτῳ, Περὶ τροφῆς ὑγιεινῶν βιβλίον ἅ. ἔστι δὲ καὶ οὗτος τῶν τινα πνεύματα σημειωσαμένων. εἰς τοῦτον ἐποίησεν Ἐ. τωθαστικὸν ἐπίγραμμα.

PLUTARCH, ON ISIS AND OSIRIS

Ἄκρωνα γοῦν τὸν ἰατρὸν ἐν Ἀθήναις ὑπὸ τὸν μέγαν λοιμὸν εὐδοκιμῆσαι λέγουσι πῦρ κελεύοντα παρακαλεῖν τοῖς νοσοῦσιν.

GALEN, ON THE METHOD OF HEALING

καὶ πρόσθεν μὲν ἔρις ἦν οὐ σμικρὰ νικῆσαι τῷ πλήθει τῶν εὐρημάτων ἀλλήλους ὀριγνωμένων τῶν ἐν Κῳ καὶ Κνίδῳ· διττὸν γὰρ ἔτι τοῦτο τὸ γένος ἦν τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀσίας Ἀσκληπιαδῶν ἐκλιπόντος τοῦ κατὰ Ῥόδον· ἤριζον δ' αὐτοῖς τὴν ἀγαθὴν ἔριν ἐκείνην, ἣν Ἡσίοδος ἐπῆναι, καὶ οἱ ἐκ τῆς Ἰταλίας ἰατροί, Φιλιστίων τε καὶ Ἐμπεδοκλῆς καὶ Πausanίας καὶ οἱ τούτων ἐταῖροι.

A 3

Empedocles and the physicians of Sicily

PLINY, NATURAL HISTORY

Another school, which they name the Empiric from its reliance on experience, began in Sicily, with Acron of Acragas commended by the authority of Empedocles the natural philosopher.

THE SUDA, UNDER "ACRON"

Acron of Acragas, son of Xenon. He taught at Athens at the same time as Empedocles, and so is older than Hippocrates. He wrote *On Medicine* in the Doric dialect, and one book *On Wholesome Nourishment*. He too is among those who noted certain winds. Empedocles composed a mocking epigram upon him.

PLUTARCH, ON ISIS AND OSIRIS

They say that Acron the physician made his name at Athens during the great plague, by ordering fires to be kept burning beside the sick.

GALEN, ON THE METHOD OF HEALING

In earlier times there was no small rivalry between the schools of Cos and Cnidus, each striving to outdo the other in the number of its discoveries; for this branch of the Asclepiads in Asia was still twofold, the Rhodian branch having died out. And the physicians of Italy contended with them in that good rivalry which Hesiod praised — Philistion and Empedocles and Pausanias and their associates.

Four witnesses on the medical school he belonged to.

Galen names Empedocles and Pausanias together as a medical school with pupils — not as philosophers who took an interest in medicine, but as one of the three or four recognised traditions of Greek doctoring, set beside Cos and Cnidus. That is a different figure from the one in the Life, and a more solid one. Acron, whose family monument Empedocles blocked at A 1 § 65, turns out to have been the most famous physician of the city and the man credited with stopping the Athenian plague by fire.

Bearing on Volume I. Supports A 1 § 58 and A 71: he was a working physician, not an amateur. 27 cognominant in T: cognominaris in V'R. — 32 πνεύματα: that is, he belonged to the Pneumatist tradition. Compare M. Wellmann, Fragmente der griechischen Ärzte I 108 ff. The epigram is B 157.

A 4

ARISTOTLE, ON THE SOUL

τῶν δὲ φορτικωτέρων καὶ ὕδωρ τινὲς ἀπεφήναντο καθάπερ Ἴππων·
πεισθῆναι δ' εἰκόασιν ἐκ τῆς γονῆς ὅτι πάντων ὑγρά· καὶ γὰρ ἐλέγχει
τοὺς αἵμα φάσκοντας τὴν ψυχὴν, ὅτι ἡ γονὴ οὐχ αἷμα.

A 5

THE SUDA, UNDER "ZENO"

ἔγραψεν Ἐριδας, Ἐξήγησιν τῶν Ἐμπεδοκλέους, Πρὸς τοὺς
φιλοσόφους περὶ φύσεως. — τοῦτόν φασιν εὐρετὴν εἶναι τῆς
διαλεκτικῆς, ὡς Ἐμπεδοκλέα ρητορικῆς.

A 4

Hippo refutes the doctrine that the soul is blood

ARISTOTLE, ON THE SOUL

Among the coarser thinkers some declared it to be water, as Hippo did; and they seem to have been persuaded by the seed, because the seed of all creatures is moist. For Hippo also refutes those who say the soul is blood, on the ground that the seed is not blood.

Report in which Empedocles is the unnamed target.

The doctrine attacked is B 105, that thought is the blood about the heart, and the argument against it is a good one from a contemporary: if soul is blood, and the seed carries soul, the seed should be blood, and it is not. This is the earliest datable objection to anything Empedocles wrote, and it comes from inside the medical profession.

Bearing on Volume I. B 105.

3 Diels notes that Empedocles is certainly the man meant; compare Hippocrates, On Diseases I 30 and On the Sacred Disease 17.

A 5

Zeno wrote a commentary on him

THE SUDA, UNDER "ZENO"

He wrote Disputes, an Exposition of the Poems of Empedocles, and Against the Philosophers, On Nature. — They say that he was the discoverer of dialectic, as Empedocles was of rhetoric.

Late catalogue entry, but the only record of a lost book.

If the attribution is sound, Zeno of Elea wrote a commentary on Empedocles within a generation of his death — the first commentary on a philosophical poem in Europe, and entirely lost. The pairing of the two inventions repeats what Aristotle says at A 1 § 57, and the repetition matters: two independent traditions put rhetoric and dialectic in the same generation, one in Sicily and one in Italy.

Compare A 1 § 57.

A 6

ARISTOTLE, METAPHYSICS

Ἀναξαγόρας δὲ ὁ Κλαζομένιος τῇ μὲν ἡλικίαι πρότερος ὢν τούτου, τοῖς δ' ἔργοις ὕστερος ἀπείρους εἶναι φησι τὰς ἀρχάς.

A 7

SIMPLICIUS, ON THE PHYSICS

Ἐμπεδοκλῆς ὁ Ἀκραγαντῖνος οὐ πολὺ κατόπιν τοῦ Ἀναξαγόρου γεγονώς, Παρμενίδου δὲ ζηλωτῆς καὶ πλησιαστής καὶ ἔτι μᾶλλον τῶν Πυθαγορείων.

A 6

Older in years, later in his work

ARISTOTLE, METAPHYSICS

Anaxagoras of Clazomenae, who was older than Empedocles in years but later in his work, says that the principles are unlimited in number.

Aristotle on the relative dating of Anaxagoras.

Six words that have been argued over for two thousand years. Anaxagoras was the older man; his philosophy, Aristotle says, is the later thing. Whether that means he started late or that his system is an advance on Empedocles', Aristotle does not say — and the ambiguity is the reason the priority of the two men is still unsettled.

Bonitz observed that Aristotle's phrase leaves it open whether "later in his work" refers to when Anaxagoras began to philosophise, or to the maturity of his doctrines.

A 7

A pupil of Parmenides, and more still of the Pythagoreans

SIMPLICIUS, ON THE PHYSICS

Empedocles of Acragas, who came not long after Anaxagoras, an emulator and an associate of Parmenides, and still more of the Pythagoreans.

From Theophrastus, through Simplicius.

This is Theophrastus' own placing of him, and it is the one most modern accounts follow: Parmenides for the argument, the Pythagoreans for the way of life. The last four words, which tip the balance toward Pythagoras, may be a later hand.

Diels doubts that the clause about the Pythagoreans comes from Theophrastus; compare Diogenes Laertius VIII 54.

A 8-A 10

EUSEBIUS, PREPARATION FOR THE GOSPEL

Τηλαύγου δὲ Ἐ. ἀκουστῆς γίνεται, καθ' ὃν Ἡράκλειτος ὁ σκοτεινὸς ἐγνωρίζετο.

EUSEBIUS, CHRONICLE

Ἐ. καὶ Παρμενίδης φυσικοὶ φιλόσοφοι ἐγνωρίζοντο.

AULUS GELLIUS, ATTIC NIGHTS

iuxta ea tempora E. Agrigentinus in philosophiae naturalis studio floruit.

A 8-A 10

The dates: three chronicles that do not agree

EUSEBIUS, PREPARATION FOR THE GOSPEL

Empedocles becomes a pupil of Telauges, in whose time Heraclitus the Obscure was well known.

EUSEBIUS, CHRONICLE

Empedocles and Parmenides, natural philosophers, were well known. [At the eighty-first Olympiad, 456 BC; and again at the eighty-sixth, 436 BC.]

AULUS GELLIUS, ATTIC NIGHTS

About that time Empedocles of Acragas flourished in the study of natural philosophy.

Chronological notices, ranging over seventy years.

Three chronicles put his prime at, respectively, about 504, 456 and 436 BC. The spread is nearly seventy years, and it shows what ancient chronology was worth when it had nothing to anchor to. Only Apollodorus at A 1 § 52 had an anchor — the Olympic victory of the grandfather — and his date, a birth around 492, is the one that has held.

The Gellius notice, probably from Cornelius Nepos' chronicle, falls between the battle at the Cremera (477 BC) and the Decemvirate (450 BC).

A 11-A 12

ATHENAEUS, THE LEARNED BANQUETERS

Ἐ. δ' ὁ Ἀκραγαντῖνος ἵπποις Ὀλύμπια νικήσας Πυθαγορικὸς ὢν καὶ ἐμψύχων ἀπεχόμενος ἐκ σμύρνης καὶ λιβανωτοῦ καὶ τῶν πολυτελεστάτων ἀρωμάτων βοῦν ἀναπλάσας διένειμε τοῖς εἰς τὴν πανήγυριν ἀπαντήσασιν.

ATHENAEUS, THE LEARNED BANQUETERS

τοὺς δ' Ἐμπεδοκλέους Καθαροὺς ἐραψώιδησεν Ὀλυμπίασι Κλεομένης ὁ ῥαψωιδός, ὥς φησιν Δικαίαρχος ἐν τῷ Ὀλυμπικῷ.

A 11–A 12

The ox of spices, and the Purifications recited at Olympia

ATHENAEUS, THE LEARNED BANQUETERS

Empedocles of Acragas, when he had won the Olympic victory with horses, being a Pythagorean and abstaining from living things, moulded an ox out of myrrh and frankincense and the costliest spices, and distributed it to those who had come to the festival.

ATHENAEUS, THE LEARNED BANQUETERS

The Purifications of Empedocles were recited at Olympia by Cleomenes the rhapsode, as Dicaearchus says in his Olympic Discourse.

Two notices from Athenaeus, the second from a pupil of Aristotle.

The bloodless ox appears at A 1 § 53 too, made there of honey and barley-meal rather than spices — a discrepancy that suggests the story is older than either version. The second notice is the more valuable: Dicaearchus was Aristotle's pupil, and he records that the Purifications were performed at Olympia by a professional reciter. The poem was not a private document but a public performance, delivered where the whole Greek world could hear it.

Bearing on Volume I. The occasion B 112 seems to imagine.

Either the grandfather's victory or the son's has here been transferred to Empedocles himself; compare A 1 §§ 51 and 53.

A 13-A 14

NICOMACHUS, ON THE WONDERS OF PYTHAGORAS

ὧν μεταλαβόντας Ἐμπεδοκλέα τε τὸν Ἀκραγαντῖνον καὶ Ἐπιμενίδην τὸν Κρηῖτα καὶ Ἄβριν τὸν Ὑπερβόρειον πολλαχῇ καὶ αὐτοὺς τοιαῦτά τινα ἐπιτετελεκέναι. δῆλα δ' αὐτῶν τὰ ποιήματα ὑπάρχει, ἄλλως τε καὶ ἄλεξανέμας μὲν ὃν τὸ ἐπώνυμον Ἐμπεδοκλέους, καθαρτῆς δὲ τὸ Ἐπιμενίδου, αἰθροβάτης δὲ τὸ Ἀβάριδος.

PLUTARCH, ON BEING A BUSYBODY

ὁ δὲ φυσικὸς Ἐμπεδοκλῆς ὄρους τινὰ διασφάγα βαρὺν καὶ νοσῶδη κατὰ τῶν πεδίων τὸν νότον ἐμπνέουσιν ἐμφράξας λοιμὸν ἔδοξεν ἐκκλεῖσαι τῆς χώρας.

PLUTARCH, AGAINST COLOTES

Ἐ. δὲ τοὺς τε πρώτους τῶν πολιτῶν ὑβρίζοντας καὶ διαφοροῦντας τὰ κοινὰ ἐξελέγξας (τὴν πόλιν ἡλευθέρωσε) τὴν τε χώραν ἀπήλλαξεν ἀκαρπίας καὶ λοιμοῦ διασφάξας ὄρους ἀποτειχίσας δι' ὧν ὁ νότος εἰς τὸ πεδῖον ὑπερέβαλλε.

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, MISCELLANIES

Ἐ. τε ὁ Ἀκραγαντῖνος κωλυσανέμας ἐπεκλήθη. λέγεται οὖν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀκράγαντος ὄρους πνέοντός ποτε ἀνέμου βαρὺ καὶ νοσῶδες τοῖς ἐγχωρίοις, ἀλλὰ καὶ ταῖς γυναῖξιν αὐτῶν ἀγονίας αἰτίου γινομένου, παῦσαι τὸν ἄνεμον.

A 13–A 14

The wind-stopper among the wonder-workers; and what he actually did

NICOMACHUS, ON THE WONDERS OF PYTHAGORAS

Empedocles of Acragas, Epimenides of Crete and Abaris the Hyperborean took a share of these powers, and themselves accomplished many such things in many places. Their poems make it plain — not least because the surname of Empedocles was Averter of Winds, that of Epimenides Purifier, and that of Abaris Walker on Air.

PLUTARCH, ON BEING A BUSYBODY

Empedocles the natural philosopher blocked up a cleft in a mountain through which the south wind blew heavy and sickly down upon the plains, and was held to have shut the plague out of the country.

PLUTARCH, AGAINST COLOTES

Empedocles convicted the leading citizens of outrage and of embezzling public property, and <set the city free>; and he rid the countryside of barrenness and of plague by walling off the clefts of a mountain through which the south wind came over into the plain.

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, MISCELLANIES

Empedocles of Acragas was surnamed Wind-stopper. The story is that when a wind once blew from the mountain of Acragas, heavy and unwholesome for the inhabitants and a cause of barrenness in their women as well, he stopped the wind.

Legend and its likely original, side by side.

Four witnesses, and the sequence from the last to the first is the whole history of a legend in miniature. Plutarch, twice, describes an engineering work: a gap in a hillside walled off so that a sickly wind no longer reaches the plain, with the fall in disease that would follow. Clement has the deed but no longer the wall. Nicomachus has only the epithet, and files it beside a man who walked on air. The same story is at A 1 § 60, where the wall has become asses' hides. The plainest version is the earliest, and it is not a miracle.

Bearing on Volume I. B 111 promises power over winds; this is what that promise looked like on the ground.

2–3 the words in angle brackets are supplied by Diels. — 11 Kayser conjectures "blowing out of season." — 35 ἐμπνέουσιν: Reiske conjectures ἐκπνέουσιν.

A 15

IAMBlichus, LIFE OF PYTHAGORAS

Ἐ. δὲ σπασαμένου τὸ ξίφος ἤδη νεανίου τινὸς ἐπὶ τὸν αὐτοῦ
ξενοδόχον Ἀγχιτον, ἐπεὶ δικάσας δημοσίαι τὸν τοῦ νεανίου πατέρα
ἐθανάτωσε, καὶ αἰξάντος, ὥς εἶχε συγχύσεως καὶ θυμοῦ, ξιφήρους
παῖσαι τὸν τοῦ πατρὸς καταδικαστὴν ὥσανεὶ φονέα Ἀγχιτον,
μεθαρμοσάμενος ὥς εἶχε τὴν λύραν καὶ πεπαντικόν τι μέλος καὶ
κατασταλτικὸν μεταχειρισάμενος εὐθὺς ἀνεκρούσατο τὸ νηπενθές τε
ἄχολόν τε κακῶν ἐπίληθες ἀπάντων κατὰ τὸν ποιητὴν, καὶ τὸν τε
ἑαυτοῦ ξενοδόχον Ἀγχιτον θανάτου ἐρρύσατο καὶ τὸν νεανίαν
ἀνδροφονίας. ἱστορεῖται δ' οὗτος τῶν Ἐμπεδοκλέους γνωρίμων ὁ
δοκιμώτατος ἔκτοτε γενέσθαι.

A 15

The lyre, the drawn sword, and the name of Pausanias

IAMBlichus, LIFE OF PYTHAGORAS

When a young man had already drawn his sword against Anchitos, Empedocles' host — because Anchitos, sitting as a public judge, had condemned the young man's father to death — and was rushing at him, sword in hand, in all his confusion and rage, to strike down the man who had sentenced his father as though he were his murderer, Empedocles retuned the lyre he was holding, took up a soothing and settling melody, and struck up at once the strain that is, in the poet's words, "without grief, without anger, a forgetting of all ills." And so he saved his host Anchitos from death and the young man from becoming a murderer. And this young man is recorded to have become, from that time, the most distinguished of Empedocles' companions.

Anecdote from a Neoplatonist Life, with a textual accident inside it.

Diels's observation turns a piece of Pythagorean edification into something better. B 1 opens the On Nature by addressing "Pausanias, son of wise Anchitos" — so the host and the avenger have been confused, and the youth here is the pupil to whom the whole poem is dedicated, and the beloved of A 1 § 60. What survives, then, is a story about how Empedocles and Pausanias met: a courtroom killing, a drawn sword, and a man who stopped it by changing the tuning of a lyre.

Bearing on Volume I. B 1, where Pausanias is named son of Anchitos.

The quotation is Homer, Odyssey IV 221. Diels notes that the young man is certainly Pausanias, the son of Anchitos, whose name has been transferred by mistake to the host.

A 16

STRABO, GEOGRAPHY

νομίζειν δ' ἐκ τῆς τοιαύτης ὀψεως πολλὰ μυθεύεσθαι καὶ μάλιστα οἷά φασι τινες περὶ Ἐμπεδοκλέους, ὅτι καθάλοιτο εἰς τὸν κρατῆρα καὶ καταλίποι τοῦ πάθους ἵχνος τῶν ἐμβάδων τὴν ἑτέραν ὥς ἐφόρει χαλκᾶς. εὑρεθῆναι γὰρ ἔξω μικρὸν ἄπωθεν τοῦ χείλους τοῦ κρατῆρος ὡς ἀνερριμμένην ὑπὸ τῆς βίας τοῦ πυρός.

HORACE, THE ART OF POETRY

si curet quis opem ferre et demittere funem, "qui scis, an prudens huc se deiecerit atque servari nolit?" dicam, Siculique poetae narrabo interitum. deus immortalis haberi dum cupit Empedocles, ardentem frigidus Aetnam insiluit. sit ius liceatque perire poetis: invitum qui servat, idem facit occidenti.

A 16

The bronze sandal, and Horace on the right to die

STRABO, GEOGRAPHY

One must suppose that a sight of this kind breeds a great deal of storytelling — above all the sort of thing some people say about Empedocles: that he leapt down into the crater and left, as a trace of what befell him, one of the bronze boots he used to wear; for it was found a little way outside the lip of the crater, as though thrown up by the force of the fire.

HORACE, THE ART OF POETRY

And if anyone should trouble to bring help and let down a rope: "How do you know he did not throw himself in on purpose, and does not want to be saved?" I shall say — and I shall tell the death of the Sicilian poet. Wanting to be thought an immortal god, Empedocles coolly jumped into burning Etna. Let poets have the right and the licence to perish: whoever saves a man against his will does the same as one who kills him.

Reception: a geographer's scepticism and a poet's joke.

Strabo, who knew the mountain, does not deny the story so much as explain it: a volcano is the kind of sight that generates tales. Horace has stopped caring whether it happened. By the Augustan age the leap into Etna has become a stock example in a handbook of literary manners — the punchline in a joke about not rescuing poets — and that is the form in which it reached the modern world, by way of Hölderlin and Matthew Arnold. What the joke required, and what it destroyed, is the man Timaeus describes at A 1 §§ 71–72.

Bearing on Volume I. A 1 §§ 69–72, where the story is told and then demolished.

A 17

PSEUDO-ARISTOTLE, PROBLEMS

τῶν δὲ ὕστερον Ἐ. καὶ Πλάτων καὶ Σωκράτης καὶ ἕτεροι συχνοὶ τῶν
γνωρίμων.

A 18

AELIAN, HISTORICAL MISCELLANY

Ἐμπεδοκλῆς δὲ ὁ Ἀκραγαντῖνος ἀλουργεῖ ἐχρήσατο καὶ ὑποδήμασι
χαλκοῖς.

PHILOSTRATUS, LIFE OF APOLLONIUS

Ἐ. μὲν γὰρ καὶ στρόφιον τῶν ἀλουργοτάτων περὶ αὐτὴν ἀρμόσας
ἐσόβει περὶ τὰς τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἀγνιὰς ὕμνους ξυντιθείς, ὥς θεὸς ἐξ
ἀνθρώπου ἔσοιτο.

A 17

Among the melancholics

PSEUDO-ARISTOTLE, PROBLEMS

And of later men, Empedocles and Plato and Socrates, and a good many other well-known figures [were melancholics].

Pseudo-Aristotelian; one clause, and a large afterlife.

The famous thirtieth book of the Problems asks why all men outstanding in philosophy, poetry or the arts turn out to be melancholic, and this list is its roll of examples. It is the beginning of the idea that genius is a temperament, and through Ficino, who translated it, it becomes the Renaissance doctrine of the saturnine man of letters. Empedocles heads the list.

The Problems are a compilation of the Peripatetic school, not Aristotle's own work. Compare Lucian, The Runaways 2.

A 18

Purple and bronze, and a man walking the streets of Greece

AELIAN, HISTORICAL MISCELLANY

Empedocles of Acragas wore purple, and shoes of bronze.

PHILOSTRATUS, LIFE OF APOLLONIUS

Empedocles fitted a band of the deepest purple about his hair and swept through the streets of the Greek cities composing hymns, meaning to become a god instead of a man.

Two late notices confirming the dress described at A 1 § 73.

Four independent witnesses now give the same costume — purple, gold, bronze shoes, a Delphic wreath — and none of them is in a position to have taken it from another. Whatever else in this Life is legend, the dress is not: he really did go about looking like that, and the last clause of Philostratus states plainly what the citizens were meant to conclude.

Bearing on Volume I. B 112, where he enters the towns garlanded and is greeted as a god.

Compare A 1 § 73 and A 2.

A 19

SEXTUS EMPIRICUS, AGAINST THE PROFESSORS

Ἐμπεδοκλέα μὲν γὰρ ὁ Ἀριστοτέλης φησὶ πρῶτον ῥητορικὴν
κεκινήκεναι.

QUINTILIAN, THE ORATOR'S EDUCATION

nam primus post eos quos poetae tradiderunt movisse aliqua circa
rhetoricen E. dicitur. artium autem scriptores antiquissimi Corax et
Tisias Siculi, quos insecutus est vir eiusdem insulae Gorgias
Leontinus, Empedoclis, ut traditur, discipulus.

ARISTOTLE, SOPHISTICAL REFUTATIONS

οἱ δὲ νῦν εὐδοκιμοῦντες παραλαβόντες παρὰ πολλῶν οἶον ἐκ
διαδοχῆς κατὰ μέρος προαγαγόντων οὕτως ηὔξήκασιν, Τεισίας μὲν
μετὰ τοὺς πρῶτους, Θρασύμαχος δὲ μετὰ Τεισίαν.

SCHOLIAST ON IAMBlichus, LIFE OF PYTHAGORAS

ὥστε ἐκ Πυθαγόρου ἤρξατο ἡ διαλεκτική, ὡσαύτως δὲ ἡ ῥητορική·
Τισίας γὰρ καὶ Γοργίας καὶ Πῶλος Ἐμπεδοκλέους τοῦ Πυθαγορείου
μαθηταί.

A 19

The invention of rhetoric, and the line of descent

SEXTUS EMPIRICUS, AGAINST THE PROFESSORS

Aristotle says that Empedocles was the first to set rhetoric in motion.

QUINTILIAN, THE ORATOR'S EDUCATION

For Empedocles is said to have been the first, after those whom the poets hand down, to have set anything moving in the matter of rhetoric. The oldest writers of handbooks were Corax and Tisias, both Sicilians, and after them came a man of the same island, Gorgias of Leontini, who is said to have been Empedocles' pupil.

ARISTOTLE, SOPHISTICAL REFUTATIONS

Those who are held in repute today received the art from many hands, as it were by succession, each carrying it forward a little, and so have enlarged it — Tisias after the first men, Thrasyarchus after Tisias.

SCHOLIAST ON IAMBlichus, LIFE OF PYTHAGORAS

So dialectic began from Pythagoras, and rhetoric likewise; for Tisias and Gorgias and Polus were pupils of Empedocles the Pythagorean.

Four witnesses to one claim of Aristotle's.

Aristotle's claim is bare — Empedocles set rhetoric moving — and the later writers supply a genealogy to go with it: Empedocles to Gorgias, Gorgias to Athens, and from Athens everything. The scholiast pushes it one step further back, to Pythagoras, which is a Neoplatonist's tidiness rather than history. What survives the sceptics is the middle link, since Gorgias' pupilage is independently attested at A 1 § 58.

Bearing on Volume I. A 1 §§ 57–58.

Aristotle's own phrase at Sophistical Refutations 183b is "after the first men," which Diels takes to be the passage Sextus and Quintilian are summarising.

A 20

PARIS GNOMOLOGY

Ἐμπεδοκλῆς ἐρωτηθεὶς, διὰ τί σφόδρα ἀγανακτεῖ κακῶς ἀκούων,
ἔφη· ὅτι οὐδὲ ἐπαινούμενος ἡσθήσομαι, εἰ μὴ κακῶς ἀκούων
λυπηθήσομαι.

PARIS GNOMOLOGY

Ἐ. πρὸς τὸν λέγοντα ὅτι οὐδένα σοφὸν εὐρεῖν δύναμαι, κατὰ λόγον
εἶπε· τὸν γὰρ ζητοῦντα σοφὸν αὐτὸν πρῶτον εἶναι δεῖ σοφόν.

A 20

Two sayings

PARIS GNOMOLOGY

Empedocles, asked why he was so vexed at being spoken ill of, said:
"Because I shall take no pleasure in being praised either, if I am not
pained at being spoken ill of."

PARIS GNOMOLOGY

To a man who said "I can find no one who is wise," Empedocles
replied: "Reasonably enough; for a man looking for someone wise
must first be wise himself."

Apophthegms from a Byzantine collection; the attribution is weak, the sayings are good.

Diels notes that the better version of the second saying belongs to Xenophanes, and collections of this kind move a good line from one famous name to another without scruple. They are printed because Diels printed them, and because the first is a real argument: praise and blame are the same faculty, and a man who is indifferent to one has disqualified himself from the other.

The second saying is given more accurately by Diogenes Laertius IX 20, where it is assigned to Xenophanes.

A 21

LUCRETII, ON THE NATURE OF THINGS

et qui quattuor ex rebus posse omnia rentur / ex igni terra atque
anima procreare et imbri, / quorum Acragantinus cum primis
Empedocles est, / insula quem triquetris terrarum gessit in oris, /
quam fluitans circum magnis anfractibus aequor / Ionium glaucis
aspargit virus ab undis / angustoque freto rapidum mare dividit
undans / Italiae terrarum oras a finibus eius.

LUCRETII, ON THE NATURE OF THINGS

hic est vasta Charybdis, et hic Aetnaea minantur / murmura
flammarum rursum se colligere iras, / faucibus eruptos iterum vis ut
vomat ignis / ad caelumque ferat flammae fulgura rursum. / quae cum
magna modis multis miranda videtur / gentibus humanis regio
visendaque fertur, / rebus opima bonis, multa munita virum vi, / nil
tamen hoc habuisse viro praeclarius in se / nec sanctum magis et
mirum carumque videtur.

LUCRETII, ON THE NATURE OF THINGS

carmina quin etiam divini pectoris eius / vociferantur et exponunt
praeclara reperta, / ut vix humana videatur stirpe creatus.

A 21

Lucretius on Sicily and on Empedocles

LUCRETIIUS, ON THE NATURE OF THINGS

And those who hold that all things can grow out of four — out of fire and earth and breath and rain — of whom Acragantine Empedocles stands among the first: an island bore him, on the three-cornered coasts of the lands, an island round which the Ionian water, flowing in its great windings, scatters the salt spray from its grey-green waves, and from whose borders the racing sea, surging through a narrow strait, divides the shores of the Italian land.

LUCRETIIUS, ON THE NATURE OF THINGS

Here is vast Charybdis, and here the mutterings of Etna threaten to gather up the fires' wrath once more, so that its violence may again vomit out the flames torn from its throat and carry the lightnings of its fire back up to heaven. And though this country seems in many ways a great marvel to the peoples of the earth, and is said to be worth the journey — rich in good things, and fortified with a great strength of men — yet it appears to have had in it nothing more glorious than this man, nothing more holy, more wonderful, or more dear.

LUCRETIIUS, ON THE NATURE OF THINGS

More than that: the songs of his divine breast cry aloud and set forth his glorious discoveries, so that he scarcely seems to have been begotten of human stock.

Reception, and the greatest tribute one poet of nature paid another.

Lucretius is about to spend sixty lines demolishing the four elements, and this is his preface to the demolition. The praise is not a courtesy: he means that the island's volcanoes and whirlpools, the things travellers cross the sea to look at, are less remarkable than the man, and he ends by denying that Empedocles was quite human. No Greek source says anything so warm. It is also the passage that transmitted Empedocles to Latin Europe — for a thousand years, more people met him here than anywhere else.

Bearing on Volume I. The four roots of B 6 and B 17, as they looked to a poet writing two centuries later in another language.

720 undans Lachmann: undis in the manuscripts. — 724 vomat Lambinus: omniat in the manuscripts.

A 22-A 23

ARISTOTLE, POETICS

οὐδὲν δὲ κοινόν ἐστιν Ὀμήρῳ καὶ Ἐμπεδοκλεῖ πλὴν τὸ μέτρον· διὸ τὸν μὲν ποιητὴν δίκαιον καλεῖν, τὸν δὲ φυσιολόγον μᾶλλον ἢ ποιητὴν.

MENANDER RHETOR

φυσικοὶ δ' ὁποίους οἱ περὶ Παρμενίδην καὶ Ἐμπεδοκλέα ἐποίησαν, τίς ἢ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος φύσις, τίς ἢ τοῦ Διὸς παρατιθέμενοι. καὶ οἱ πολλοὶ τῶν Ὀρφέως τούτου τοῦ τρόπου.

MENANDER RHETOR

εἰσὶν δὲ τοιοῦτοι, ὅταν Ἀπόλλωνος ὕμνον λέγοντες ἥλιον αὐτὸν εἶναι φάσκωμεν καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἡλίου τῆς φύσεως διαλεγώμεθα καὶ περὶ Ἥρας ὅτι ἀῆρ καὶ Ζεὺς τὸ θερμόν. οἱ γὰρ τοιοῦτοι ὕμνοι φυσιολογικοί. καὶ χρῶνται δὲ τῷ τοιούτῳ τρόπῳ Παρμενίδης καὶ Ἐ. ... Παρμενίδης μὲν γὰρ καὶ Ἐ. ἐξηγοῦνται, Πλάτων δὲ ἐν βραχυτάτοις ἀναμνησκει.

A 22–A 23

Is he a poet? Aristotle says no; the handbooks of hymn-writing say yes

ARISTOTLE, POETICS

Homer and Empedocles have nothing in common except the metre; so it is right to call the one a poet, and the other a natural philosopher rather than a poet.

MENANDER RHETOR

Natural hymns are of the kind that Parmenides and Empedocles composed, setting out what the nature of Apollo is, and what the nature of Zeus. Most of the hymns of Orpheus are of this sort.

MENANDER RHETOR

They are of this kind: when, in singing a hymn to Apollo, we assert that he is the sun, and discourse about the nature of the sun; and about Hera, that she is air, and Zeus, that he is the hot. Hymns of this sort are natural-philosophical. Parmenides and Empedocles use this manner ... for Parmenides and Empedocles expound it at length, while Plato recalls it in the fewest words.

Reception, on the question that would not go away.

Aristotle's sentence has decided the question for most of European criticism, and it is worth noticing how narrow it is: he says the two men share only the metre, and calls Empedocles a natural philosopher — not a bad poet. The rhetorician takes the opposite view, and from a more useful angle: what Empedocles wrote was a hymn of a recognised kind, in which a god is expounded as a natural force. On that description the B 6 lines are not a riddle needing a key but an ordinary procedure of the genre.

Bearing on Volume I. B 6, and the dispute over the divine names set out at A 33.

The hymn to Apollo is the one A 1 § 57 says was burnt. On Hera as air and Zeus as the hot, compare B 6, 2 and A 33.

A 24-A 25

LACTANTIUS, DIVINE INSTITUTES

Empedocles, quem nescias utrumne inter poetas an inter philosophos numeres, quia de rerum natura versibus scripsit ut apud Romanos Lucretius et Varro, quattuor elementa constituit.

SCHOLIAST ON DIONYSIUS THRAX

ἀμέλει τὸν Ἐμπεδοκλέα καὶ Τυρταῖον καὶ τοὺς περὶ ἀστρολογίας εἰπόντας οὐ καλοῦμεν ποιητάς, εἰ καὶ μέτρῳ ἐχρήσαντο, διὰ τὸ μὴ χρήσασθαι αὐτοὺς τοῖς τῶν ποιητῶν χαρακτηριστικοῖς. — οὐκ ἔστι ποιητῆς ὁ μέτρῳ μόνῳ χρώμενος· οὐδὲ γὰρ Ἐμπεδοκλῆς ὁ τὰ Φυσικὰ γράψας οὐδ' οἱ περὶ ἀστρολογίας εἰπόντες οὐδὲ ὁ Πύθιος ἐμμέτρως χρησμοιδῶν.

ARISTOTLE, RHETORIC

οἱ γὰρ τοιοῦτοι ἐν ποιήσει λέγουσιν ταῦτα οἷον Ἐμπεδοκλῆς. φενακίζει γὰρ τὸ κύκλῳ πολὺ ὄν, καὶ πάσχουσιν οἱ ἀκροαταὶ ὅπερ οἱ πολλοὶ παρὰ τοῖς μάντεσιν· ὅταν γὰρ λέγωσιν ἀμφίβολα, συμπαρανεύουσιν.

ARISTOTLE, METEOROLOGY

ὁμοίως δὲ γελοῖον καὶ εἴ τις εἰπὼν ἰδρῶτα τῆς γῆς εἶναι τὴν θάλατταν οἶται τι σαφὲς εἰρηκέναι, καθάπερ Ἐ. πρὸς ποίησιν μὲν γὰρ οὕτως εἰπὼν ἴσως εἴρηκεν ἱκανῶς, ἢ γὰρ μεταφορὰ ποιητικόν, πρὸς δὲ τὸ γνῶναι τὴν φύσιν οὐχ ἱκανῶς.

A 24–A 25

The verdict of the handbooks

LACTANTIUS, DIVINE INSTITUTES

Empedocles — whom you would not know whether to count among the poets or among the philosophers, since he wrote about the nature of things in verse, as Lucretius and Varro did among the Romans — laid down four elements.

SCHOLIAST ON DIONYSIUS THRAX

We do not, of course, call Empedocles a poet, or Tyrtaeus, or those who have written about astronomy, even though they used metre — because they did not employ the things that mark out poets. — A man is not a poet merely by using metre; neither Empedocles, who wrote the Physics, nor those who have written on astronomy, nor the Pythian god delivering his oracles in verse.

ARISTOTLE, RHETORIC

Men of this kind talk so in their poetry — Empedocles, for instance. For a long circuit of words cheats the hearer, and his audience is affected as most people are by soothsayers: when they speak ambiguously, the hearers nod along with them.

ARISTOTLE, METEOROLOGY

It is equally absurd if a man, having said that the sea is the sweat of the earth, supposes he has said something clear — as Empedocles does. For poetry, put that way, he has perhaps said enough, since metaphor is a poetic thing; but for knowing the nature of a thing, he has not.

A 24–A 25 (continued)

CICERO, ON THE ORATOR

liceat ista ratione dicamus pila bene et duodecim scriptis ludere proprium esse iuris civilis, quoniam utrumque eorum P. Mucius optime fecerit; eademque ratione dicantur ei quos φυσικοὺς Graeci nominant, eidem poetae, quoniam Empedocles physicus egregium poema fecerit.

A 24–A 25 (continued)

CICERO, ON THE ORATOR

On that reasoning we may say that playing ball well, and playing at draughts, belong to the civil law, because Publius Mucius did both supremely well; and by the same reasoning let those whom the Greeks call natural philosophers be called poets too, because Empedocles the natural philosopher wrote an excellent poem.

Reception: six witnesses, five of them denying he is a poet.

The Life ends on the question it could not settle. Five of these six deny him the name of poet, and they deny it on the same ground: metre is not enough, and what he wrote was instruction. Two things are worth noticing against them. Aristotle's charge in the Rhetoric is not that the verse is bad but that it is persuasive — that a long circuit of words carries an audience along as an oracle does, which is a complaint about power, not weakness. And Cicero's joke concedes the point it means to mock: everyone agreed the poem was excellent. What they could not agree was what to call a man who had written the best poem in a genre they did not think was poetry.

Bearing on Volume I. A 22, Aristotle's verdict in the Poetics, of which these are the echoes.

24 the name Tyrtaeus has not yet been satisfactorily emended. Compare Plutarch, How the Young Should Study Poetry 2. The sea as the earth's sweat is A 66.

THE DOCTRINE

Principles, Cosmos and Cycle

Diels-Kranz 31 A 26 – A 56

The four roots and the two powers that move them; the identification of the four divine names of B 6; mixture; the Sphairos; the cosmic cycle; and the formation and shape of the world.

Three disputes run through this part and are not settled in it. The divine names of B 6 are given different keys by different witnesses, and they disagree exactly where it matters: Aëtius makes Hera the air and Aidoneus the earth, while the Homeric Allegories, Hippolytus, and Diogenes Laertius at A 1 § 76 all reverse the pair. The modern handbooks follow Aëtius; the ancient tally runs three to one the other way.

The cycle is stated symmetrically by Simplicius, who names a cosmos of Love and a cosmos of Strife and quotes the poem for it — and denied by Aristotle, who says Empedocles passed over the world-formation under Love because it could not be made to work. Both stand below.

And mixture: Aristotle says that on this physics nothing is ever truly blended, only stacked like a wall of bricks, and the doxographers go further, crediting Empedocles with particles smaller than the roots. The verse, where bone is a fixed ratio, reads otherwise.

A 26

DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS, DE COMPOSITIONE VERBORUM 22

ταύτης τῆς ἁρμονίας [τῆς αὐστηρᾶς] πολλοὶ μὲν ἐγένοντο ζηλωταὶ κατὰ τε ποίησιν καὶ ἱστορίαν καὶ λόγους πολιτικούς, διαφέροντες δὲ τῶν ἄλλων ἐν μὲν ἐπικῇ ποιήσει ὃ τε Κολοφώνιος Ἀντίμαχος καὶ Ἐμπεδοκλῆς ὁ φυσικός, ἐν δὲ μελοποιίᾳ Πίνδαρος, ἐν τραγωιδίᾳ δ' Αἰσχύλος.

A 27

CICERO, AD QUINTUM FRATREM II 9,3

Lucretii poemata ut scribis ita sunt: multis luminibus ingenii, multae etiam artis; sed (cum veneris) virum te putabo, si Sallustii Empedoclea legeris, hominem non putabo.

A 26

Empedocles ranked among the masters of the "austere" mode of composition.

DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS, DE COMPOSITIONE VERBORUM 22

Of this mode of composition — the austere — there were many devotees, in poetry, in history and in civic oratory; but pre-eminent above the rest were, in epic verse, Antimachus of Colophon and Empedocles the natural philosopher; in lyric, Pindar; and in tragedy, Aeschylus.

Report (literary judgement, not doctrine).

Evidence for how Empedocles was read as a stylist. Dionysius classes him with Antimachus, not with Homer.

A 27

Cicero on Lucretius, and on the Latin Empedoclea of Sallustius.

CICERO, AD QUINTUM FRATREM II 9,3

Lucretius' poems are as you describe them: with many flashes of genius, and much artistry too. But — when you come — I shall count you a hero if you get through the Empedoclea of Sallustius, and scarcely count you human.

Report (reception).

Not about Empedocles' own text but about a Latin poem after him. The joke turns on virum/hominem and does not survive intact in English; the rendering keeps the two words distinct.

A 28

ARISTOTLE, METAPHYSICS A 3

Ἐ. δὲ τὰ τέτταρα πρὸς τοῖς εἰρημένοις γῆν προσθεῖς τέταρτον· ταῦτα γὰρ ἀεὶ διαμένειν καὶ οὐ γίγνεσθαι ἀλλ' ἢ πλήθει καὶ ὀλιγότητι συγκρινόμενα καὶ διακρινόμενα εἰς ἓν τε καὶ ἐξ ἑνός.

SIMPLICIUS, PHYSICS 25,21, FROM THEOPHRASTUS

οὗτος δὲ τὰ μὲν σωματικὰ στοιχεῖα ποιεῖ τέτταρα, πῦρ καὶ ἀέρα καὶ ὕδωρ καὶ γῆν, αἶδια μὲν ὄντα, πλήθει δὲ καὶ ὀλιγότητι μεταβάλλοντα κατὰ τὴν σύγκρισιν καὶ διάκρισιν, τὰς δὲ κυρίως ἀρχάς, ὑφ' ὧν κινεῖται ταῦτα, Φιλίαν καὶ Νεῖκος. δεῖ γὰρ διατελεῖν ἐναλλάξ κινούμενα τὰ στοιχεῖα, ποτὲ μὲν ὑπὸ τῆς Φιλίας συγκρινόμενα, ποτὲ δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ Νείκους διακρινόμενα· ὥστε καὶ ἕξ εἶναι κατ' αὐτὸν τὰς ἀρχάς.

A 28

The four roots as eternal and unchanging; Love and Strife as the moving principles; Aristotle's charge of inconsistency.

ARISTOTLE, METAPHYSICS A 3

Empedocles added earth as a fourth to those already named, making four; for these, he holds, always persist and do not come to be, save that they become more or fewer, being combined into one and separated out of one.

SIMPLICIUS, PHYSICS 25,21, FROM THEOPHRASTUS

He makes the corporeal elements four — fire and air and water and earth — eternal, but altering in respect of more and fewer by combination and separation; while the principles properly so called, by which these are moved, are Love and Strife. For the elements must go on being moved alternately, at one time combined by Love, at another separated by Strife — so that on his account the principles are six.

Report, then criticism. Simplicius continues by charging Empedocles with treating Love and Strife inconsistently: in one place giving them an active power (quoting B17.7-8), in another ranking them alongside the four as of equal standing (quoting B17.17-20).

στοιχεῖα here is Aristotle's and Theophrastus' word, not Empedocles', who says ῥιζώματα, roots. The substitution is invisible in the Greek and consequential: it is the vocabulary by which Empedocles became, in the handbooks, the man who discovered the four elements. — "Six principles" is likewise an analysis imposed from outside; no fragment counts them.

A 29

PLATO, SOPHIST 242C-D

μῦθόν τινα ἕκαστος φαίνεται μοι διηγεῖσθαι παισὶν ὡς οὖσιν ἡμῖν ...
Ἰάδες δὲ καὶ Σικελαὶ τινες ὕστερον Μοῦσαι ξυνενόησαν, ὅτι
συμπλέκειν ἀσφαλέστατον ἀμφοτέρω καὶ λέγειν, ὡς τὸ ὄν πολλά τε
καὶ ἓν ἐστίν, ἔχθραι δὲ καὶ φιλίαι συνέχεται. "διαφερόμενον γὰρ ἀεὶ
ξυμφέρεται", φασὶν αἱ συντονώτεραι τῶν Μουσῶν, αἱ δὲ
μαλακώτεραι τὸ μὲν ἀεὶ ταῦθ' οὕτως ἔχειν ἐχάλασαν, ἐν μέρει δὲ τοτὲ
μὲν ἓν εἶναι φασὶ τὸ πᾶν καὶ φίλον ὑπ' Ἀφροδίτης, τοτὲ δὲ πολλὰ καὶ
πολέμιον αὐτὸ αὐτῶι διὰ Νεϊκός τι.

A 29

The Ionian and Sicilian Muses; Empedocles' one-and-many against Heraclitus'.

PLATO, SOPHIST 242C-D

Each of them seems to me to be telling us a story, as though we were children ... But certain Ionian and, later, Sicilian Muses perceived that it was safest to weave both together and to say that what is is both many and one, and is held together by enmity and by friendship. "For in differing it is always brought together," say the more strenuous of the Muses; while the gentler relaxed the requirement that this hold always, and say instead that by turns the All is at one time one and at friendship under Aphrodite, and at another many and at war with itself through a certain Strife.

Report, and the earliest interpretation of Empedocles we have.

The "Sicilian Muses" are Empedocles, the "Ionian" Heraclitus; Plato names neither. The contrast he draws — always-so against by-turns — is the first statement of the alternation, and the phrase ἐν μέλει is picked up in B17 and B26. Plato is characterising, not quoting, and the reader should weigh it as such.

A 30

PS.-PLUTARCH, STROMATEIS, IN EUSEBIUS P.E. I 8,10

θέντα τὸν ἀέρα περιχυθῆναι κύκλῳ· μετὰ δὲ τὸν ἀέρα τὸ πῦρ ἐκδραμὸν καὶ οὐκ ἔχον ἑτέραν χώραν ἄνω ἐκτρέχειν ὑπὸ τοῦ περὶ τὸν ἀέρα πάγου. εἶναι δὲ κύκλῳ περὶ τὴν γῆν φερόμενα δύο ἡμισφαίρια τὸ μὲν καθόλου πυρός, τὸ δὲ μικτὸν ἐξ ἀέρος καὶ ὀλίγου πυρός, ὅπερ οἶεται τὴν νύκτα εἶναι. τὴν δὲ ἀρχὴν τῆς κινήσεως συμβῆναι ἀπὸ τοῦ τετυχηκέναι κατὰ <τι> τὸν ἀθροισμὸν ἐπιβρίσαντος τοῦ πυρός. ὁ δὲ ἥλιος τὴν φύσιν οὐκ ἔστι πῦρ, ἀλλὰ τοῦ πυρός ἀντανάκλασις ὁμοία τῇ ἀφ' ὕδατος γινομένη. σελήνην δὲ φησιν συστήναι καθ' ἑαυτὴν ἐκ τοῦ ἀποληφθέντος ἀέρος ὑπὸ τοῦ πυρός. τοῦτον γὰρ παγῆναι καθάπερ καὶ τὴν χάλαζαν. τὸ δὲ φῶς αὐτὴν ἔχειν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἡλίου. τὸ δὲ ἡγεμονικὸν οὔτε ἐν κεφαλῇ οὔτε ἐν θώρακι, ἀλλ' ἐν αἵματι. ὅθεν καθ' ὅτι ἂν μέρος τοῦ σώματος πλεῖον ᾗ παρεσπαρμένον (τὸ ἡγεμονικὸν οἶεται), κατ' ἐκεῖνο προτερεῖν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. Ἐ. ὁ Ἀκραγαντῖνος στοιχεῖα τέσσαρα, πῦρ ὕδωρ αἰθέρα γαῖαν. αἰτίαν δὲ τούτων Φιλίαν καὶ Νεῖκος. ἐκ πρώτης φησὶ τῆς τῶν στοιχείων κράσεως ἀποκρι[θέντα ...]

A 30

The cosmogony: the air poured round, the fire running out, the two hemispheres, sun and moon, and the seat of thought in the blood.

PS.-PLUTARCH, STROMATEIS, IN EUSEBIUS P.E. I 8,10

Empedocles of Acragas [holds] four elements — fire, water, aither, earth; and as the cause of these, Love and Strife. He says that out of the first blending of the elements there was separated off the air was poured round in a circle; and after the air, the fire ran out and, having nowhere else to go, ran up beneath the solid that surrounds the air. There are two hemispheres carried round the earth, the one wholly of fire, the other mixed of air and a little fire — and this last he takes to be night. The beginning of the motion came about from the massing together of the fire that bore down upon it. The sun is not fire by nature, but a reflection of fire like that which comes from water. The moon, he says, was formed on its own out of the air cut off by the fire — for this was congealed like hail — and has its light from the sun. The governing part is neither in the head nor in the breast but in the blood; and therefore in whatever part of the body more of it is spread, in that part men have the advantage.

Report (doxographic, from Theophrastus).

τὸ ἡγεμονικόν, "the governing part", is Stoic vocabulary and not Empedocles'; the underlying claim, that thought is in the blood, is his (cf. B105). The word is the doxographer's frame.

A 31

HIPPOLYTUS, REFUTATIO I 3 (D. 558)

(1) Ἐ. δὲ μετὰ τούτους γενόμενος καὶ περὶ δαιμόνων φύσεως εἶπε πολλά, ὥς ἀναστρέφονται διοικοῦντες τὰ κατὰ τὴν γῆν, ὄντες πλεῖστοι. οὗτος τὴν τοῦ παντὸς ἀρχὴν Νεῖκος καὶ Φιλίαν ἔφη καὶ τὸ τῆς μονάδος νοερὸν πῦρ τὸν θεὸν καὶ συνεστάναι ἐκ πυρὸς τὰ πάντα καὶ εἰς πῦρ ἀναλυθήσεσθαι. ὧι σχεδὸν καὶ οἱ Στωικοὶ συντίθενται δόγματι ἐκπύρωσιν προσδοκῶντες. (2) μάλιστα δὲ πάντων συγκατατίθεται τῇ μετενσωματώσει οὕτως εἰπών· "ἦτοι ... ἰχθύς" [B 117]. (3) οὗτος πάσας εἰς πάντα τὰ ζῶια μεταλλάττειν εἶπε τὰς ψυχάς. καὶ γὰρ ὁ τούτων διδάσκαλος Πυθαγόρας ἔφη ἑαυτὸν Εὐφορβὸν γεγονέναι τὸν ἐπὶ Ἴλιον στρατεύσαντα φάσκων ἐπιγινώσκειν τὴν ἀσπίδα.

A 31

The daimones; Strife and Love as principle; transmigration.

HIPPOLYTUS, REFUTATIO I 3 (D. 558)

(1) Empedocles, coming after these, said much also about the nature of daimones — how, being very many, they go about governing the things upon the earth. He said that the principle of the universe is Strife and Love, and that the intelligible fire of the monad is god, and that all things are composed out of fire and will be resolved into fire; which opinion the Stoics too very nearly accept. (2) He assents above all to the doctrine of passing into new bodies, saying: "For I have already been ..." [B117]. (3) He said that all souls pass over into all living creatures. For Pythagoras, his teacher, said that he had himself been Euphorbus, who went on the campaign against Ilion, and claimed to recognise his shield.

Report, with interpretation folded in.

Hippolytus reads the whole system through the daimones, which is why this notice opens with them rather than with the roots — and that reading is itself an argument against a clean division between a physical poem and a religious one. — "the intelligible fire of the monad" is not Empedoclean language; the monad is Pythagorean-Platonist vocabulary, and Hippolytus' own comparison to the Stoics shows him assimilating. — ψυχή is Hippolytus' word; Empedocles does not use it of the transmigrating self.

A 32

AETIUS I 7,28 (D. 303)

Ἐμπεδοκλῆς σφαιροειδὲς καὶ αἰδίον καὶ ἀκίνητον τὸ ἓν καὶ τὸ μὲν ἓν τὴν ἀνάγκην, ὕλην δὲ αὐτῆς τὰ τέτταρα στοιχεῖα, εἶδη δὲ τὸ Νεῖκος καὶ τὴν Φιλίαν. λέγει δὲ καὶ τὰ στοιχεῖα θεοὺς καὶ τὸ μῖγμα τούτων τὸν κόσμον καὶ πρὸς τούτοις τὸν Σφαῖρον, εἰς ὃν πάντα ταῦτα' ἀναλυθήσεται, τὸ μονοειδές. καὶ θείας μὲν οἶεται τὰς ψυχάς, θείους δὲ καὶ τοὺς μετέχοντας αὐτῶν καθαρὸς καθαρῶς.

A 33

AETIUS I 3,20

Ἐ. Μέτωνος Ἀκραγαντίνος τέτταρα μὲν λέγει στοιχεῖα, πῦρ ἀέρα ὕδωρ γῆν, δύο δὲ ἀρχικὰς δυνάμεις, Φιλίαν τε καὶ Νεῖκος, ὧν ἡ μὲν ἐστὶν ἐνωτική, τὸ δὲ διαιρετικόν. φησὶ δὲ οὕτως· "τέσσαρα ... βρότειον" [B 6]. Δία μὲν γὰρ λέγει τὴν ζέσιν καὶ τὸν αἰθέρα, Ἥρην δὲ φερέσβιον τὸν ἀέρα, τὴν δὲ γῆν τὸν Αἰδωνέα. Νῆστιν δὲ καὶ κρούνωμα βρότειον οἶονεὶ τὸ σπέρμα καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ. ... καὶ θερμότητος καὶ ψυχρότητος, ὑπὸ τῆς πρὸς ἄλληλα ἀναλογίας καὶ κράσεως ἐναπεργαζομένης τὸ πᾶν καὶ μεταβολὰς μὲν μερικὰς ὑπομενούσης, τοῦ δὲ παντὸς λύσιν μὴ ἐπιδεχομένης. λέγει γὰρ οὕτως· "ἄλλοτε ... ἔχθει" [B 17, 7.8].

HOMERIC ALLEGORIES, IN STOBÆUS

Ἐ. Δία μὲν λέγει τὴν ζέσιν (καὶ) τὸν αἰθέρα, Ἥρην δὲ φερέσβιον τὴν γῆν, ἀέρα δὲ τὸν Αἰδωνέα, ἐπειδὴ φῶς οἰκεῖον οὐκ ἔχει, ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ ἡλίου καὶ σελήνης καὶ ἄστρον καταλάμπεται, Νῆστιν δὲ καὶ κρούνωμα βρότειον τὸ σπέρμα καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ. ἐκ τεσσάρων οὖν στοιχείων τὸ πᾶν, τῆς τούτων φύσεως ἐξ ἐναντίων συνεστῶσης, ξηρότητός τε καὶ ὑγρότητος ...

A 32

The One as spherical, eternal, unmoved; the elements as gods; the Sphairos.

AËTIUS I 7,28 (D. 303)

(Empedocles holds that the One is spherical and eternal and unmoved), and that the One is Necessity, its matter being the four elements and its forms Strife and Love. He calls the elements gods, and the mixture of them the cosmos; and into these the uniform Sphairos will be resolved. He holds souls to be divine, and divine also those pure men who share in them purely.

Report (doxographic, compressed).

The opening clause stands in angle brackets in Diels: it is supplied from Stobaeus and is not in the Aëtius text as transmitted. — "matter" and "forms" are Aristotelian categories laid over Empedocles; he has neither word.

the opening clause is supplied from Stobaeus and stands in angle brackets in Diels; τ(οῦτοις ... ταῦτ)' is likewise supplied (Usener).

A 33

A third identification of the four divine names, with reasons given.

AËTIUS I 3,20

Empedocles son of Meton, of Acragas, says there are four elements — fire, air, water, earth — and two original powers, Love and Strife, of which the one unites and the other divides. He speaks thus: "Hear first the four roots of all things ..." [B6]. For by Zeus he means fire and aither; by life-bearing Hera, the air; by Aidoneus, the earth; and by Nestis and the mortal spring, seed and water. ... and of heat and cold; and by the proportion and blending of these with one another the All is wrought, undergoing partial changes while admitting no dissolution of the whole. For he speaks thus: 'at one time ... in hatred' [B 17,7-8].

HOMERIC ALLEGORIES, IN STOBÆUS

By Zeus he means the boiling heat and the aither; by life-bearing Hera, the earth; by Aidoneus, the air, since it has no light of its own but is lit by sun and moon and stars; and by Nestis and the mortal spring, seed and water. Out of four elements, then, is the All, their nature composed of opposites, of dryness and wetness ...

A 33 (continued)

HIPPOLYTUS, REFUTATIO VII 29

Ζεὺς ἐστὶ τὸ πῦρ, Ἥρη δὲ φερέσβιος ἢ γῆ φέρουσα τοὺς πρὸς τὸν βίον καρπούς, Αἰδωνεὺς δὲ ὁ ἀήρ, ὅτι πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ βλέποντες μόνον αὐτὸν οὐ καθορῶμεν, Νῆστις δὲ τὸ ὕδωρ· μόνον γὰρ τοῦτο ὄχημα τροφῆς [αἷτιον] γινόμενον πᾶσι τοῖς τρεφομένοις, αὐτὸ καθ' αὐτὸ τρέφειν οὐ δυνάμενον τὰ τρεφόμενα. εἰ γὰρ ἔτρεφε, φησὶν, οὐκ ἂν ποτε λιμῶι κατελήφθη τὰ ζῶια, ὕδατος ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ πλεονάζοντος ἀεί. διὰ τοῦτο Νῆστιν καλεῖ τὸ ὕδωρ, ὅτι τροφῆς αἷτιον γινόμενον τρέφειν οὐκ εὐτονεῖ τὰ τρεφόμενα.

A 33 (continued)

HIPPOLYTUS, REFUTATIO VII 29

Zeus is fire; Hera the bringer of life is earth, which bears the fruits that sustain life; Aidoneus is air, because although we see all things through it, it alone we do not see; and Nestis is water — for this alone, being the vehicle of nourishment for all things that are nourished, is not able of itself to nourish them. For if it did nourish, he says, living things would never be gripped by famine, since water is always abundant in the world. This is why he calls water Nestis: because, though it is the cause of nourishment, it has not the strength to nourish what is nourished.

Report, with the reporter's own reasoning attached.

A third tradition, and it agrees with the Homeric Allegories against Aëtius: Hera earth, Aidoneus air. Hippolytus alone gives arguments — invisibility for Aidoneus as air, and a nice etymological point for Nestis, whose name he connects with fasting (νηστis, fasting): water carries nourishment but does not itself feed, so the water-goddess is the one who goes hungry. Whether that etymology is Empedocles' or Hippolytus' cannot be told from the notice. Diogenes Laertius, summarising the doctrine at A 1 § 76, makes the same assignment as these two, so that Aëtius — whose key the modern handbooks follow — stands alone against three.

Bearing on Volume I. the introduction to Volume I records the rival identifications as a modern scholarly dispute. It is older than that. The disagreement is already fixed in the doxography, and Volume I's note should be amended to say so and to point here.

Diels brackets αἴτιον as a gloss; Kranz deletes it.

A 34

GALEN, IN HIPPOCRATIS DE NATURA HOMINIS XV 32 K

Ἐ. ἐξ ἀμεταβλήτων τῶν τεττάρων στοιχείων ἡγεῖτο γίνεσθαι τὴν τῶν συνθέτων σωμάτων φύσιν, οὕτως ἀναμειγμένων ἀλλήλοις τῶν πρώτων, ὥς εἴ τις λειώσας ἀκριβῶς καὶ χνοώδη ποιήσας ἰὸν καὶ χαλκίτιν καὶ καδμίαν καὶ μίσυ μίξειεν, ὥς μηδὲν ἐξ αὐτῶν δύνασθαι μεταχειρίσασθαι χωρὶς ἐτέρου.

A 35

AËTIUS II 7,6

Ἐ. ἔλεγε μὴ διὰ παντὸς ἐστῶτας εἶναι μὴδ' ὠρισμένους τοὺς τόπους τῶν στοιχείων, ἀλλὰ πάντα τοὺς ἀλλήλων μεταλαμβάνειν.

ACHILLES, ISAGOGÉ 4

ὁ δὲ Ἐ. οὐ δίδωσι τοῖς στοιχείοις ὠρισμένους τόπους, ἀλλ' ἀντιπαραχωρεῖν ἀλλήλοις φησὶν, ὥστε τὴν γῆν μετέωρον φέρεσθαι καὶ τὸ πῦρ ταπεινότερον.

A 36

ARISTOTLE, DE GENERATIONE ET CORRUPTIONE B 3, 330b19

ἐνιοι δ' εὐθὺς τέτταρα λέγουσιν οἶον Ἐ.· συνάγει δὲ καὶ οὗτος εἰς τὰ δύο· τῷ γὰρ πυρὶ τᾶλλα πάντα ἀντιτίθηνται.

A 34

Mixture: the elements are unchanging, and compounds arise from them by blending.

GALEN, IN HIPPOCRATIS DE NATURA HOMINIS XV 32 K

Empedocles held that the nature of composite bodies comes to be out of the four unchangeable elements, mingled together in the way that someone might grind and pulverise rust and copper-flower and cadmia and misy and mix them, so that not one of them could be taken apart from the others.

Report, with Galen's own illustration.

The metallurgical simile is Galen's, not Empedocles'; the poems use painters mixing pigments (B23) for the same point. Worth setting the two side by side — the difference is between a mixture you could in principle unmix and one you could not.

A 35

The elements have no fixed places.

AËTIUS II 7,6

He said that the places of the elements are not permanently fixed nor determined, but that all of them take each other's places.

ACHILLES, ISAGOGE 4

Empedocles does not assign the elements determinate places, but says they give way to one another, so that earth is carried aloft and fire lower down.

Report.

The Aëtius notice sits under a chapter heading about the order of the cosmos, which makes it look misfiled in a run about the elements; the content is about the elements, and Diels places it correctly.

A 36

The four reduced to two.

ARISTOTLE, DE GENERATIONE ET CORRUPTIONE B 3, 330B19

Some say straightway that there are four, as Empedocles does; yet he too draws them together into two, for he sets all the rest over against fire.

Criticism.

Aristotle's reduction, not Empedocles'. He repeats it at A37 below.

A 37

ARISTOTLE, METAPHYSICS A 4, 985A21

καὶ Ἐ. ἐπὶ πλέον μὲν χρῆται τούτου τοῖς αἰτίοις, οὐ μὴν οὐθ' ἱκανῶς οὐτ' ἐν τούτοις εὐρίσκει τὸ ὁμολογούμενον· πολλαχοῦ γοῦν αὐτῷ ἡ μὲν Φιλία διακρίνει, τὸ δὲ Νεῖκος συγκρίνει. ὅταν μὲν γὰρ εἰς τὰ στοιχεῖα διίστηται τὸ πᾶν ὑπὸ τοῦ Νείκου, τό τε πῦρ εἰς ἓν συγκρίνεται καὶ τῶν ἄλλων στοιχείων ἕκαστον· ὅταν δὲ πάλιν ὑπὸ τῆς Φιλίας συνίωσιν εἰς τὸ ἓν, ἀναγκαῖον ἔξ ἑκάστου τὰ μόρια διακρίνεσθαι πάλιν. Ἐ. μὲν οὖν παρὰ τοὺς πρότερον πρῶτος τὸ τὴν αἰτίαν διελεῖν εἰσήνεγκεν, οὐ μίαν ποιήσας τὴν τῆς κινήσεως ἀρχὴν ἀλλ' ἐτέρας τε καὶ ἐναντίας. ἔτι δὲ τὰ ὥς ἐν ὕλης εἶδει λεγόμενα στοιχεῖα τέτταρα πρῶτος εἶπεν. οὐ μὴν χρῆταί γε τέτταρσιν, ἀλλ' ὥς δυσὶν οὖσι μόνοις, πυρὶ μὲν καθ' αὐτό, τοῖς δ' ἀντικειμένοις ὥς μιᾷ φύσει, γῇ τε καὶ ἀέρι καὶ ὕδατι. λάβοι δ' ἂν τις αὐτὸ θεωρῶν ἐκ τῶν ἐπῶν.

A 37

The charge of inconsistency in the use of Love and Strife; the four as matter.

ARISTOTLE, METAPHYSICS A 4, 985A21

Empedocles uses the causes more than Anaxagoras does, yet neither sufficiently nor consistently. At all events, in many places with him Love divides and Strife combines. For whenever the All is separated into the elements by Strife, then fire is combined into one and each of the other elements likewise; but when they come together again into the one under Love, the parts must again be separated out of each. Empedocles, then, in contrast to his predecessors, was the first to introduce this cause divided, not making the source of motion one but different and contrary. Further, he was the first to speak of the four so-called elements as in the form of matter — though he does not use them as four but as two only: fire by itself, and the things opposed to it as a single nature, earth and air and water. This may be gathered by studying his verses.

Criticism throughout, with a report embedded in the first clause.

This is the most consequential passage in the volume for how Empedocles was afterwards read. Three things are Aristotle's and not Empedocles': ὕλη, "matter", is Aristotle's category; στοιχεῖα is his word; and the charge that "Love divides and Strife combines" depends on requiring an efficient cause to act univocally. On Empedocles' own account both powers do both, according to where the cycle stands — Love unites the roots and thereby separates each root from its like, and Strife conversely. Whether that is an inconsistency or the whole point of a cycle is precisely what is at issue, and Aristotle does not argue it; he assumes it. The reader should have the fragments B17, B21 and B26 open beside this.

A 38

ARISTOTLE, PHYSICS Θ 1, 252A7

ἔοικεν Ἐ. ἂν εἰπεῖν ὥς τὸ κρατεῖν καὶ κινεῖν ἐν μέρει τὴν Φιλίαν καὶ τὸ Νεῖκος ὑπάρχει τοῖς πράγμασιν ἐξ ἀνάγκης, ἡρεμεῖν δὲ τὸν μεταξὺ χρόνον.

A 39

ARISTOTLE, METAPHYSICS A 4, 984B32

ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ τάναντία τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ἐνόντα ἐφαίνετο ἐν τῇ φύσει, καὶ οὐ μόνον τάξεις καὶ τὸ καλὸν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀταξία καὶ τὸ αἰσχροὺς, καὶ πλείω τὰ κακὰ τῶν ἀγαθῶν καὶ τὰ φαῦλα τῶν καλῶν, οὕτως ἄλλος τις Φιλίαν εἰσήνεγκε καὶ Νεῖκος, ἐκάτερον ἐκατέρων αἴτιον τούτων. εἰ γάρ τις ἀκολουθοίη καὶ λαμβάνοι πρὸς τὴν διάνοιαν καὶ μὴ πρὸς ἃ ψελλίζεται λέγων Ἐ., εὐρήσει τὴν μὲν Φιλίαν αἰτίαν οὔσαν τῶν ἀγαθῶν, τὸ δὲ Νεῖκος τῶν κακῶν· ὥστ' εἴ τις φαίη τρόπον τινὰ καὶ λέγειν καὶ πρῶτον λέγειν τὸ κακὸν καὶ τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἀρχὰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα, τάχ' ἂν λέγοι καλῶς, εἴπερ τὸ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀπάντων αἴτιον αὐτὸ τάγαθόν ἐστι [καὶ τῶν κακῶν τὸ κακόν].

A 38

Love and Strife prevail by necessity and by turns, with rest between.

ARISTOTLE, PHYSICS Θ 1, 252A7

It seems that Empedocles too would say that it belongs to Love and Strife by necessity to prevail and to cause motion by turns, and that in the time between they are at rest.

Report, cautiously framed — Aristotle writes "it seems that he would say", not "he says".

The hedge matters and is kept. This is a principal piece of evidence for a period of rest between the phases of the cycle, and it is offered by Aristotle as an inference about what Empedocles would have to hold, not as a quotation.

A 39

Why a second principle was needed: the presence of evil and disorder in nature.

ARISTOTLE, METAPHYSICS A 4, 984B32

But since the contraries of the goods were also seen to be present in nature — not order and beauty only but disorder and ugliness too, and more evils than goods and more mean things than fair — accordingly another thinker introduced Love and Strife, each of them the cause of one of these. For if ... if one follows the argument out and takes it by its sense rather than by the stammering way Empedocles puts it, one will find Love the cause of good things and Strife the cause of evil. So that if one were to say that Empedocles in a way both speaks of evil and good as principles, and was the first to do so, one would perhaps be speaking rightly — if indeed the cause of all goods is the good itself.

Criticism.

"the stammering way Empedocles puts it" ($\psi\epsilon\lambda\lambda\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$) is Aristotle's standing complaint about the Presocratics: they have hold of something but cannot articulate it. He uses the same figure of Anaxagoras. It is worth keeping visible, because the moral reading of Love and Strife that follows is Aristotle's construction on a poet he has just called inarticulate.

the closing bracketed clause is absent from one branch of the tradition; Alexander had it.

A 40

ARISTOTLE, DE GENERATIONE ET CORRUPTIONE B 6, 333B20

καίτοι τά γε στοιχεῖα διακρίνει οὐ τὸ Νεῖκος ἀλλ' ἡ Φιλία, τὰ φύσει
πρότερα τοῦ θεοῦ· θεοὶ δὲ καὶ ταῦτα.

A 41

PHILOPONUS, IN DE GENERATIONE ET CORRUPTIONE 19,3 VITELLI

πρὸς μὲν γὰρ τὰ φαινόμενα ἐναντία λέγει ἀναιρῶν τὴν ἀλλοίωσιν
ἐναργῆ οὖσαν, πρὸς ἑαυτὸν δὲ διότι λέγει μὲν ἀμετάβλητα τὰ
στοιχεῖα, καὶ αὐτὰ μὲν μὴ γίνεσθαι ἐξ ἀλλήλων τὰ δὲ ἄλλα ἐκ
τούτων. πάλιν δὲ φησι τῆς Φιλίας κρατούσης τὰ πάντα ἐν γίνεσθαι
καὶ τὸν Σφαῖρον ἀποτελεῖν ἅποιον ὑπάρχοντα, ὥς μηκέτι μήτε τὴν
τοῦ πυρὸς μήτε τῶν ἄλλων τινὸς σώζεσθαι ἐν αὐτῷ ιδιότητα,
ἀποβάλλοντος ἐκάστου τῶν στοιχείων τὸ οἰκεῖον εἶδος.

A 40

The roots are prior to the god; Love separates as well as joins

ARISTOTLE, DE GENERATIONE ET CORRUPTIONE B 6, 333B20

And yet the elements are separated not by Strife but by Love, since they are by nature prior to the god; and they too are gods.

Criticism, and a report of two doctrines.

Dense and important. "the god" is the Sphairos; Aristotle's point is that the roots must be prior to it, since it is composed of them. The clause "they too are gods" reports Empedocles' own view (cf. A32) and is not Aristotle's. That the roots are gods and the Sphairos a god is the metaphysical difficulty at the centre of the system, and Aristotle states it in one line without developing it.

A 41

The Sphairos as without quality; the charge of self-contradiction.

PHILOPONUS, IN DE GENERATIONE ET CORRUPTIONE 19,3 VITELLI

For he speaks against the appearances, denying that alteration is manifest, though it plainly is; and against himself, because on the one hand he says the elements are unchangeable, and that they do not come to be out of one another but everything else out of them; while on the other he says that when Love prevails all things become one and produce the Sphairos, which is without quality, so that no longer is the property of fire, or of any of the others, preserved in it, each of the elements casting off its own proper form.

Criticism, carrying a report that is found nowhere in the verse.

The claim that the roots lose their distinctness in the Sphairos survives only here and in A32. No fragment says it. Yet it is the crux of the whole system: if the roots keep their identity in the Sphairos, the Sphairos is a mixture; if they lose it, then the roots are not after all unchangeable, which is what Philoponus is objecting. A reader of the poems alone would not know the question had been raised.

A 42

ARISTOTLE, DE CAELO Γ 2

ἐκ διεστώτων δὲ καὶ κινουμένων οὐκ εὐλογον ποιεῖν τὴν γένεσιν. διὸ καὶ Ἐ. παραλείπει τὴν ἐπὶ τῆς Φιλότητος· οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἡδύνατο συστήσαι τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐκ κεχωρισμένων μὲν κατασκευάζων, σύγκρισιν δὲ ποιῶν διὰ τὴν Φιλότητα· ἐκ διακεκριμένων γὰρ συνέστηκεν ὁ κόσμος τῶν στοιχείων. ὥστ' ἀναγκαῖον γίνεσθαι ἐξ ἑνὸς καὶ συγκεκριμένου.

ARISTOTLE, DE GEN. ET CORR. B 7

ἅμα δὲ καὶ τὸν κόσμον ὁμοίως ἔχειν φησὶν ἐπὶ τε τοῦ Νείκους νῦν καὶ πρότερον ἐπὶ τῆς Φιλίας.

A 42

Why Empedocles omits a cosmogony under Love.

ARISTOTLE, DE CAELO I 2

It is unreasonable to make coming-to-be out of things separated and in motion. This is why Empedocles passes over the coming-to-be under Love: he could not have constructed the heaven by building it out of things separated, making the combination out of separation — for the cosmos has been composed out of elements that were separated, so that it must come to be out of what is one and combined.

ARISTOTLE, DE GEN. ET CORR. B 7

At the same time he says that the cosmos is in a like condition now, under Strife, as it was formerly under Love.

Criticism, and — in the second notice — a report.

This is the passage on which the one-cosmogony and two-cosmogony readings both have to work. Aristotle states as a fact that Empedocles omits the world-formation under Love. Defenders of a symmetrical cycle must explain the omission away; defenders of a single cosmogony take it at face value. The second notice, that the cosmos is now in a like state under Strife as it once was under Love, cuts the other way. Both are printed here without adjudication.

A 43

ARISTOTLE, DE GEN. ET CORR. B 7

ἐκεῖνοις τε γὰρ τοῖς λέγουσιν ὥς ἔ. τίς ἔσται τρόπος; ἀνάγκη γὰρ σύνθεσιν εἶναι καθάπερ ἐκ πλίνθων καὶ λίθων τοῖχος· καὶ τὸ μείγμα δὲ τοῦτο ἐκ σωιζομένων μὲν ἔσται τῶν στοιχείων, κατὰ μικρὰ δὲ παρ' ἄλληλα συγκευμένων· οὕτω δὴ σὰρξ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἕκαστον.

AËTIUS I 13,1 AND I 17,3

Ἐμπεδοκλῆς ἔφη πρὸ τῶν τεττάρων στοιχείων θραύσματα ἐλάχιστα οἰονεῖ στοιχεῖα πρὸ τῶν στοιχείων ὁμοιομερῇ. ἔ. καὶ Ξενοκράτης ἐκ μικροτέρων ὄγκων τὰ στοιχεῖα συγκρίνει, ἅπερ ἐστὶν ἐλάχιστα καὶ οἰονεῖ στοιχεῖα στοιχείων.

GALEN, IN HIPPI. DE NAT. HOM.

κάκεϊνος γὰρ ἐκ μὲν τῶν αὐτῶν στοιχείων, ὧν καὶ Ἱπποκράτης, γεγονέναι φησὶν ἡμᾶς τε καὶ τὰ ἄλλα σώματα πάντα τὰ περὶ τὴν γῆν, οὐ μὴν κεκραμένων γε δι' ἀλλήλων, ἀλλὰ κατὰ μικρὰ μόρια παρακειμένων τε καὶ ψαυόντων.

A 43

Mixture by juxtaposition of small parts, not by fusion.

ARISTOTLE, DE GEN. ET CORR. B 7

For those who speak as Empedocles does — what will the manner of it be? It must be a composition, as a wall is composed of bricks and stones; and this mixture will be of elements that are preserved, but set alongside one another in small parts. And so flesh, and each of the rest.

AËTIUS I 13,1 AND I 17,3

Empedocles [posits] before the four elements the smallest fragments, as it were elements before the elements, uniform throughout. Empedocles and Xenocrates [say] that the elements are made up of smaller masses, which are the least parts and as it were elements of the elements.

GALEN, IN HIPPOCRATES DE NAT. HOM.

For he too, like Hippocrates, says that we and all other bodies about the earth came to be out of the elements themselves — not, however, blended with one another, but laid alongside and touching in small parts.

Criticism (Aristotle), then three reports.

The brick-wall image is Aristotle's and is polemical: he is arguing that on Empedocles' account nothing is ever truly mixed, only stacked. Whether Empedocles held that is disputed, and B96 — where bone is a definite ratio — reads more like a genuine compound than a stack. The Aëtius notices go further still, crediting him with particles below the roots, which no fragment supports and which may be Democritean doctrine drifting onto him in the doxography. Treat A43 as evidence about how he was read, not securely about what he held.

Diels notes στοιχεῖα πρὶν στοιχείων as a variant at I 13,1; H. Schoene's τε at Galen.

A 44

AETIUS I 24,2 (D. 320)

Ἐ., Ἀναξαγόρας, Δημόκριτος, Ἐπίκουρος καὶ πάντες ὅσοι κατὰ συναθροισμὸν τῶν λεπτομερῶν σωμάτων κοσμοποιοῦσι, συγκρίσεις μὲν καὶ διακρίσεις εἰσάγουσι, γενέσεις δὲ καὶ φθοράς οὐ κυρίως· οὐ γὰρ κατὰ τὸ ποιὸν ἐξ ἀλλοιώσεως, κατὰ δὲ τὸ ποσὸν ἐκ συναθροισμοῦ ταύτας γίνεσθαι.

A 45

AETIUS I 26,1

Ἐ. οὐσίαν ἀνάγκης αἰτίαν χρηστικὴν τῶν ἀρχῶν καὶ τῶν στοιχείων.

PLUTARCH, DE ANIMAE PROCREATIONE

... ἀνάγκην, ἣν εἰμαρμένην οἱ πολλοὶ καλοῦσιν, Ἐ. δὲ Φιλίαν ὁμοῦ καὶ Νεῖκος.

A 44

Coming-to-be and perishing are combination and separation, not qualitative change.

AËTIUS I 24,2 (D. 320)

Empedocles, Anaxagoras, Democritus, Epicurus, and all who make the cosmos by the aggregation of fine-particled bodies, introduce combinations and separations, but not comings-to-be and perishings properly so called; for these do not come about qualitatively, by alteration, but quantitatively, by aggregation.

Report.

ἀλλοίωσις, "alteration", is Peripatetic vocabulary used about him and not his own — the same flag as at A41. The doctrine itself is squarely Empedoclean and is stated in the verse at B8.

A 45

Necessity, and its identification with Love and Strife.

AËTIUS I 26,1

Empedocles [makes] the essence of necessity the cause that uses the principles and the elements.

PLUTARCH, DE ANIMAE PROCREATIONE

... necessity, which most people call fate, but Empedocles calls Love and Strife together.

Two reports, and they do not agree.

Aëtius makes Necessity a cause standing over the principles and using them; Plutarch makes it simply another name for the two powers. B115 has Ἀνάγκη issuing a decree sealed by oaths, which suits Aëtius' picture of something above the powers rather than identical with them. The disagreement is not resolved here.

A 46

ARISTOTLE, PHYSICS A 4, 187A20

οἱ δ' ἐκ τοῦ ἐνὸς ἐνούσας τὰς ἐναντιότητας ἐκκρίνεσθαι, ὥσπερ Ἀναξίμανδρός φησι καὶ ὅσοι δ' ἐν καὶ πολλά φασιν εἶναι, ὥσπερ Ἐ. καὶ Ἀναξαγόρας· ἐκ τοῦ μείγματος γὰρ καὶ οὗτοι ἐκκρίνουσι τᾶλλα, διαφέρουσι δ' ἀλλήλων τῶι τὸν μὲν περίοδον ποιεῖν τούτων, τὸν δ' ἅπαξ, καὶ τὸν μὲν ἄπειρα τὰ τε ὁμοιομερῇ καὶ τάναντία, τὸν δὲ τὰ καλούμενα στοιχεῖα.

A 47

AËTIUS I 5,2 (D. 291)

Ἐμπεδοκλῆς δὲ κόσμον μὲν ἓνα, οὐ μέντοι τὸ πᾶν εἶναι τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλὰ ὀλίγον τι τοῦ παντὸς μέρος, τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν ἀργὴν ὕλην.

A 46

Separation out of a mixture; the cycle as periodic, against Anaxagoras' single occurrence.

ARISTOTLE, PHYSICS A 4, 187A20

Others say that the contrarities are separated out of the one, as Anaximander says, and as do all who say that what is is one and many — Empedocles and Anaxagoras; for these too separate the rest out of the mixture. They differ from one another in that the one makes these things come round in a cycle, while the other makes it happen once only; and the one makes them infinite, both the uniform bodies and the contraries, while the other makes only the so-called elements.

Report, and a comparison.

The contrast with Anaxagoras is the point: Empedocles' separation is periodic and repeats, Anaxagoras' happens once. This is among the clearest ancient statements that the cycle recurs, and it comes from the earliest witness.

Diels records εἶναι τὰ ὅντα in the Aristotle manuscripts at line 2; ἄπειρα ποιεῖν likewise; στοιχεῖα μόνον, with μόνον absent from Simplicius.

A 47

The cosmos is one, but only a small part of the All.

AËTIUS I 5,2 (D. 291)

Empedocles [says] that the cosmos is one; yet the cosmos is not the whole, but a small part of the All, the remainder being inert matter.

Report.

ἀργή ὄλη, "inert matter", is not Empedoclean vocabulary. But the underlying claim — that the ordered world occupies only part of what there is — has no support in any surviving fragment, and if it is genuine it matters considerably for how the cosmic cycle is pictured. Treat with caution.

A 48

PLATO, LAWS X 889B

πῦρ καὶ ὕδωρ καὶ γῆν καὶ ἀέρα φύσει πάντα εἶναι καὶ τύχῃ φασί, τέχνῃ δὲ οὐδὲν τούτων, καὶ τὰ μετὰ ταῦτα αὖ σώματα, γῆς τε καὶ ἡλίου καὶ σελήνης ἄστρον τε πέρι, διὰ τούτων γεγονέναι παντελῶς ὄντων ἀψύχων. τύχῃ δὲ φερόμενα τῇ τῆς δυνάμεως ἕκαστα ἐκάστων ἢ συμπτώκεν ἀρμόττοντα οἰκείως πως, θερμὰ ψυχροῖς ἢ ξηρὰ πρὸς ὑγρὰ καὶ μαλακὰ πρὸς σκληρά, καὶ πάντα ὅποσα τῇ τῶν ἐναντίων κράσει κατὰ τύχην ἐξ ἀνάγκης συνεκεράσθη, ταύτῃ καὶ κατὰ ταῦτα οὕτω γεγεννηκέναι τόν τε οὐρανὸν ὅλον καὶ πάντα ὅποσα κατ' οὐρανόν, καὶ ζῶια αὖ καὶ φυτὰ ξύμπαντα, ὥρων πασῶν ἐκ τούτων γενομένων, οὐ διὰ νοῦν, φασίν, οὐδὲ διὰ τινὰ θεὸν οὐδὲ διὰ τέχνην, ἀλλὰ ὃ λέγομεν, φύσει καὶ τύχῃ.

A 48

The world by nature and chance, without mind, god or art.

PLATO, LAWS X 889B

Fire and water and earth and air, they say, all exist by nature and by chance, and none of them by art; and the bodies that came after these — earth, sun, moon and stars — came to be through these, which are wholly without soul. Each was carried about by chance according to the power each had, and as they fell together and were fitted somehow suitably — hot to cold, or dry to moist, or soft to hard, and all that was of necessity mixed by the blending of opposites according to chance — in this way and by these means they generated the whole heaven and all that is in it, and all animals and plants in turn, once all the seasons had come to be from these; not by mind, they say, nor by any god nor by art, but, as we put it, by nature and by chance.

Report of a position, with the name suppressed.

Diels prints this as a testimony to the followers of Empedocles, not to Empedocles, and Plato names nobody. It is the fullest ancient statement of the chance-cosmogony the system was taken to imply, and it is hostile: Plato is building a case against atheism. Whether Empedocles himself made chance do this much work is exactly what B103 and B104 leave open. The reader should not take this as Empedocles speaking.

A 49

AËTIUS II 6,3

Ἐ. τὸν μὲν αἰθέρα πρῶτον διακριθῆναι, δεύτερον δὲ τὸ πῦρ, ἐφ' ᾧ τὴν γῆν, ἐξ ἧς ἄγαν περισφιγγομένης τῇ ρύμῃ τῆς περιφορᾶς ἀναβλύσαι τὸ ὕδωρ· ἐξ οὗ θυμιαθῆναι τὸν ἀέρα, καὶ γενέσθαι τὸν μὲν οὐρανὸν ἐκ τοῦ αἰθέρος, τὸν δὲ ἥλιον ἐκ τοῦ πυρός, πιληθῆναι δὲ ἐκ τῶν ἄλλων τὰ περίγεια.

PHILO, DE PROVIDENTIA II 60

eodem modo etiam mundi partes confici videntur, ut dicit Empedocles. postquam enim secretus est aether (i.e. μετὰ τὸ διακριθῆναι τὸν αἰθέρα), aer et ignis sursus volaverunt et caelum formatum quod in latissimo spatio circumferebatur. ignis autem qui caelo paulo inferior manserat, ipse quoque in radios solis coacervatus est. terra vero in unum concurrens et necessitate quadam concreta (πιληθεῖσα) in medio apparens consedit. porro circa eam undique aether, quia multo levior erat, volvitur neque umquam desistit.

A 49

The order of separation in the cosmogony.

AËTIUS II 6,3

Empedocles [says] that the aether was separated off first, the fire second, and after that the earth — from which, squeezed exceedingly tight by the force of the rotation, water gushed forth; and out of the water air was exhaled; and the heaven came to be out of the aether, the sun out of the fire, and the things about the earth were compacted out of the rest.

PHILO, DE PROVIDENTIA II 60

In the same way the parts of the world too appear to be made, as Empedocles says. For after the aether was separated off, air and fire flew upward, and the heaven was formed, which was carried round in the widest space. But the fire that had remained a little below the heaven was itself gathered together into the rays of the sun. The earth, however, running together into one and compacted by a certain necessity, settled and appeared in the middle. Round about it on every side the aether, being much lighter, is rolled and never ceases ...

Two reports, broadly agreeing on the order.

The Philo text is at three removes — Greek lost, Armenian version, Latin rendering of the Armenian — and the Latin has been corrected by conjecture. It carries correspondingly little weight on any point of wording, though it agrees with Aëtius on the sequence. The rotation that squeezes water out of the earth is the δίνη, the vortex, which is genuinely Empedoclean vocabulary and not an importation.

Diels flags the Latin as uncertain at several points — circumiectus est ... gyros after Conybeare; ignis where another manuscript has formae; the parenthesis quietis ... per deum referred by Conybeare to Aristotle's doctrine of circular motion. Galen and Reiske give ἀναθυμαθῆναι at the Aëtius line.

A 50

AETIUS II 31,4 AND II 1,4

Ἐ. τοῦ ὕψους τοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἀφ' ἡμῶν ἀνάτασις, πλείονα εἶναι τὴν κατὰ τὸ πλάτος διάστασιν κατὰ τοῦτο τοῦ οὐρανοῦ μᾶλλον ἀναπεπταμένου διὰ τὸ ὥϊοι παραπλησίως τὸν κόσμον κεῖσθαι. Ἐ. τὸν τοῦ ἡλίου περιδρομον εἶναι περιγραφὴν τοῦ πέρατος τοῦ κόσμου.

AETIUS II 10,2

Ἐ. δεξιὰ μὲν αὐτοῦ [τοῦ κόσμου] τὰ κατὰ τὸν θερινὸν τροπικόν, ἀριστερὰ δὲ τὰ κατὰ τὸν χειμερινόν.

A 50

The shape of the cosmos; the sun's circuit as its boundary.

AËTIUS II 31,4 AND II 1,4

Empedocles [says] that the height of the heaven from the earth — that is, the distance upward from us — is less than its breadth laid out sideways, the heaven being spread further in that direction, because the cosmos lies in a manner resembling an egg. Empedocles [says] that the circuit of the sun is the outline of the limit of the cosmos.

AËTIUS II 10,2

Empedocles [says] that the right of the cosmos is toward the summer tropic, the left toward the winter.

Reports.

The egg-shaped cosmos is not in any fragment. It is a notable claim, since the Sphairos of B27-B29 is emphatically spherical; the two are not necessarily in conflict, the Sphairos belonging to the phase of Love's dominance and this to the present world, but the edition should not smooth the difference.

A 51

AËTIUS II 11,2

Ἐ. στερέμνιον εἶναι τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐξ ἀέρος συμπαγέντος ὑπὸ πυρὸς κρυσταλλοειδῶς, τὸ πυρῶδες καὶ τὸ ἀερῶδες ἐν ἑκατέρῳ τῶν ἡμισφαιρίων περιέχοντα.

ACHILLES, ISAGOGÉ 5

Ἐ. δὲ κρυσταλλῶδη τοῦτον εἶναί φησιν ἐκ τοῦ παγετώδους συλλεγέντα.

SCHOLIA ON BASIL

Ἐ. δὲ ὕδροπαγῇ [τὸν οὐρανόν] καὶ οἶονεὶ κρυσταλλῶδες πῖλημα.

LACTANTIUS, DE OPIFICIO DEI

an si mihi quispiam dixerit aeneum esse caelum aut vitreum aut, ut Empedocles ait, aerem glaciatum, statimne assentiar?

A 51

The heaven as solid, crystalline, made of frozen air.

AËTIUS II 11,2

Empedocles [says] the heaven is solid, of air compacted by fire in the manner of crystal, containing in each of the two hemispheres the fiery and the airy.

ACHILLES, ISAGOGE 5

Empedocles says it is crystalline, gathered together out of what is frozen.

SCHOLIA ON BASIL

Empedocles [says] the heaven is compacted of water, and is as it were a crystalline felting.

LACTANTIUS, DE OPIFICIO DEI

But if someone were to tell me that the heaven is of bronze or of glass, or — as Empedocles says — that it is frozen air, am I to assent at once?

Four reports, in agreement.

No fragment describes the heaven. The doctrine is well attested across independent witnesses, and Lactantius, though hostile and late, is quoting it as a familiar absurdity, which is itself evidence that it was firmly attached to his name.

Diels records κρυσταλλῶδες ἐκ τοῦ παγετώδους συλλεγέντος εἶναι in one witness, and πύλημα against ἐπείλημα.

A 52

AETIUS II 4,8

Ἐ. τὸν κόσμον φθείρεσθαι κατὰ τὴν ἀντεπικράτειαν τοῦ Νείκου καὶ τῆς Φιλίας.

SIMPLICIUS, DE CAELO 293,18 AND 305,21

οἱ δὲ ἐναλλάξ γίνεσθαι καὶ φθείρεσθαι τὸν αὐτὸν καὶ πάλιν γενόμενον πάλιν φθείρεσθαι λέγουσι, καὶ αἰδίων εἶναι τὴν τοιαύτην διαδοχὴν, ὥσπερ Ἐ. τὴν Φιλίαν λέγων καὶ τὸ Νεῖκος παρὰ μέρος ἐπικρατοῦντα τὴν μὲν συνάγειν τὰ πάντα εἰς ἓν καὶ φθείρειν τὸν τοῦ Νείκου κόσμον καὶ ποιεῖν ἐξ αὐτοῦ τὸν Σφαῖρον, τὸ δὲ Νεῖκος διακρίνειν πάλιν τὰ στοιχεῖα καὶ ποιεῖν τὸν τοιοῦτον κόσμον. Πλάτων καὶ Ἐ. καὶ Ἀναξαγόρας καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι φυσικοὶ τὴν τῶν συνθέτων ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπλῶν γένεσιν κατὰ τὸν ἐξ ὑποθέσεως τοῦτον τρόπον φαίνονται παραδιδόντες ... ὥσπερ καὶ προὔπηρχον τῷ χρόνῳ τὰ ἐξ ὧν γίνεται τὰ γινόμενα.

ARISTOTLE, METAPHYSICS B 4

οὐ γὰρ τὰ μὲν φθαρτά, τὰ δ' ἀφθαρτά ποιεῖ τῶν ὄντων, ἀλλ' ἅπαντα φθαρτὰ πλὴν τῶν στοιχείων.

A 52

The destruction of the cosmos, and the alternation of the two cosmic states.

AËTIUS II 4,8

Empedocles [says] the cosmos is destroyed by the counter-prevailing of Strife and of Love.

SIMPLICIUS, DE CAELO 293,18 AND 305,21

Others say that it comes to be and perishes by turns, and that having come to be it perishes again, and that this succession is everlasting — as Empedocles does, who says that Love and Strife prevail in turn, Love drawing all things together into one and destroying the cosmos of Strife and making the Sphairos out of it, while Strife separates the elements again and makes a cosmos of this present kind. Plato and Empedocles and Anaxagoras and the other natural philosophers seem to hand down the coming-to-be of composite things out of simple ones in this manner by hypothesis — that is, for the sake of teaching — as though the things out of which the things that come to be come to be had pre-existed in time.

ARISTOTLE, METAPHYSICS B 4

For he does not make some things perishable and others imperishable, but all things perishable except the elements.

Reports, with Simplicius 305,21 an interpretation.

The most important notice in the tranche for the shape of the cycle. Simplicius states the alternation plainly, names two cosmoi — a cosmos of Strife and a cosmos of Love — and quotes B17.7-13 to support it. That is the symmetrical reading, stated by the witness who had most of the poem in front of him. Against it stands Aristotle at A42, that Empedocles omits the world-formation under Love. Both are in this volume and the edition does not choose between them. — Simplicius at 305,21 is doing something different and should not be read as a report: he is suggesting that the successive stages were never meant temporally at all, but are an expository device. That is a Neoplatonist's way of rescuing the text, and it is the ancestor of every non-literal reading of the cycle since.

Simplicius at 293,18 quotes B 17,7-13 immediately after. At 305,21 Diels glosses διδασκαλίας χάριν — "for the sake of teaching".

A 53

AETIUS II 13,2 (D. 341)

Ἐ. πύρινα [εἶναι τὰ ἄστρα] ἐκ τοῦ πυρώδους, ὅπερ ὁ ἀῆρ ἐν ἑαυτῷ περιέχων ἐξανέθλιψε κατὰ τὴν πρώτην διάκρισιν.

A 54

AETIUS II 13,11 (D. 342)

Ἐ. τοὺς μὲν ἀπλανεῖς ἀστέρας συνδεδέσθαι τῷ κρυστάλλῳ, τοὺς δὲ πλανήτας ἀνεῖσθαι.

A 55

ACHILLES, IN ARATUM 16 P. 43,2 MAASS

εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ πρῶτον τὸν ἥλιον λέγουσιν, δευτέραν δὲ τὴν σελήνην, τρίτον δὲ τὸν Κρόνον. ἡ δὲ πλείων δόξα πρώτην τὴν σελήνην, ἐπεὶ καὶ ἀπόσπασμα τοῦ ἡλίου λέγουσιν αὐτὴν. ὥς καὶ Ἐ. "κυκλοτερεῖς ... φῶς" [B 45].

A 53

The stars are fire squeezed out of the air

AËTIUS II 13,2 (D. 341)

Empedocles [says the stars are] fiery, made out of the fiery stuff which the air, containing it in itself, squeezed out at the first separation.

A 54

Fixed stars bound to the crystal; the planets go free

AËTIUS II 13,11 (D. 342)

Empedocles [says] the fixed stars are bound fast to the crystal, but the planets go free.

Depends on the crystalline heaven of A51.

A 55

The moon as a fragment struck off the sun.

ACHILLES, IN ARATUM 16 P. 43,2 MAASS

There are some who say that the sun is first, the moon second, and Kronos third. But the more prevailing opinion puts the moon first, since they say that it is a fragment broken off from the sun — as Empedocles too says: "A light not her own circles round the earth in a ring" [B45].

Report, with a verse quotation.

One of the places where a testimony carries a fragment; B45 is in Volume I.

Diels notes ἀπόρρασμα as a variant for ἀπόσπασμα.

A 56

AĒTIUS II 20,13 (D. 350)

Ἐ. δύο ἡλίους· τὸν μὲν ἀρχέτυπον, πῦρ ὃν ἐν τῷ ἐτέρῳ ἡμισφαιρίῳ τοῦ κόσμου, πεπληρωκὸς τὸ ἡμισφαίριον, αἰεὶ κατ' ἀντικρὺ τῇ ἀνταυγείᾳ ἑαυτοῦ τεταγμένον· τὸν δὲ φαινόμενον, ἀνταύγειαν ἐν τῷ ἐτέρῳ ἡμισφαιρίῳ τῷ τοῦ ἀέρος τοῦ θερμομιγοῦς πεπληρωμένῳ, ἀπὸ κυκλοτεροῦς τῆς γῆς κατ' ἀνάκλασιν γιγνομένην εἰς τὸν ἥλιον τὸν κρυσταλλοειδῆ, συμπεριελκομένην δὲ τῇ κινήσει τοῦ πυρίνου. ὥς δὲ βραχέως εἰρῆσθαι συντεμόντα, ἀνταύγειαν εἶναι τοῦ περὶ τὴν γῆν πυρὸς τὸν ἥλιον. [21,2] ἴσον τῇ γῇ τὸν κατὰ τὴν ἀνταύγειαν.

A 56

The two suns.

AËTIUS II 20,13 (D. 350)

Empedocles [posits] two suns. The one is archetypal: fire in the one hemisphere of the cosmos, filling that hemisphere, and always stationed directly opposite its own reflection. The other is the apparent sun — a reflection in the other hemisphere, the one filled with air mingled with heat, arising from the reflection of the rounded earth upon the crystalline sun, and carried round with the motion of the fiery one. To put it briefly: the sun is a reflection of the fire about the earth. [21,2] And it is equal to the earth, the one that is according to the reflection.

Report.

Diels' own apparatus at this page says flatly that the account of the sun is unclear. It is the strangest doctrine in the tranche and no fragment supports it, though B44 and B47 are consistent with a sun that shines by reflection. The edition prints it as it stands.

Diels marks συντεμόντα as an old gloss, and notes in his own apparatus that the report on the sun is unclear.

THE DOCTRINE, CONTINUED

Light, Sea, Plants and the Making of Bodies

Diels-Kranz 31 A 57 – A 85

Light and its speed; the tilt of the heavens; the moon; weather; the sea; plants; the four generations of living things; and the physiology of flesh, bone, breath, birth, sleep and death.

Two numbers here are worth coming to forewarned. A 57 is the earliest statement anywhere that light takes time to travel, and Aristotle records it only in order to reject it — on the ground, still a good one in his day, that nobody has ever caught light in transit. A 78 is the centre of the volume: bone, Aristotle concedes, is not fire nor earth nor all four of the elements but the ratio of their mixture, and on that one point he grants that Empedocles was led by the truth itself.

Twenty of these thirty numbers carry more than one witness, and A 81 carries nine, of very unequal worth. Where the witnesses on a number are not of the same standing, the note below the translation says so.

A 57

ARISTOTLE, ON THE SOUL

οὐκ ὀρθῶς Ἔ. οὐδ' εἴ τις ἄλλος οὕτως εἴρηκεν, ὥς φερομένου τοῦ φωτὸς καὶ γιγνομένου ποτὲ μεταξὺ τῆς γῆς καὶ τοῦ περιέχοντος, ἡμᾶς δὲ λανθάνοντος ... ἐν μικρῷ μὲν γὰρ διαστήματι λάθοι ἄν, ἀπ' ἀνατολῆς δ' ἐπὶ δυσμᾶς τὸ λανθάνειν μέγα λίαν τὸ αἶτημα.

ARISTOTLE, ON SENSE AND SENSE-OBJECTS

καθάπερ καὶ Ἔ. φησιν ἀφικνεῖσθαι πρότερον τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἡλίου φῶς εἰς τὸ μεταξύ, πρὶν πρὸς τὴν ὄψιν ἢ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν.

PHILOPONUS, ON ARISTOTLE'S ON THE SOUL

Ἔ. ὅς ἔλεγεν ἀπορρέον τὸ φῶς σῶμα ὃν ἐκ τοῦ φωτίζοντος σώματος γίνεσθαι πρῶτον ἐν τῷ μεταξὺ τόπῳ τῆς τε γῆς καὶ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, εἴτα ἀφικνεῖσθαι πρὸς ἡμᾶς, λανθάνειν δὲ τὴν τοιαύτην αὐτοῦ κίνησιν διὰ τὴν ταχύτητα.

A 57

Light travels, and takes time to travel

ARISTOTLE, ON THE SOUL

Empedocles is not right, nor is anyone else who has spoken in this way — that light travels, and comes to be at some moment in the space between the earth and what surrounds us, while we fail to notice it ... Over a short interval it might indeed escape notice; but that it should escape notice all the way from sunrise to sunset is far too much to ask.

ARISTOTLE, ON SENSE AND SENSE-OBJECTS

As Empedocles too says: the light from the sun arrives first at the space between, before it reaches the sight or the earth.

PHILOPONUS, ON ARISTOTLE'S ON THE SOUL

Empedocles, who said that light, being a body, streams off from the illuminating body and comes to be first in the place between the earth and the heaven, and then arrives at us; and that a motion of this kind escapes our notice because of its speed.

Report, hostile in Aristotle, defended in Philoponus.

Aristotle reports the doctrine in order to reject it, and the ground of the rejection is worth marking: he does not say that light is not a body, but that no one has ever caught it in transit. The objection is empirical, and it is the objection that stood for two thousand years. Philoponus, defending Empedocles, supplies the answer Aristotle did not consider — that the interval is real but too brief to observe.

Bearing on Volume I. This is the earliest recorded statement that light has a finite speed.

418b20 γιγνομένου so also Themistius and Philoponus; τεινομένου in the manuscripts EV. — 446a26 τὸ μεταξύ] τὸν μεταξύ in EM, perhaps rightly, i.e. the visible sun.

A 58

AËTIUS

Ἐ. τοῦ ἀέρος εἵξαντος τῇ τοῦ ἡλίου ὀρμῇ ἐπικλιθῆναι τὰς ἄρκτους, καὶ τὰ μὲν βόρεια ὑψωθῆναι, τὰ δὲ νότια ταπεινωθῆναι, καθ' ὃ καὶ τὸν ὅλον κόσμον.

AËTIUS

Ἐ. ὑπὸ τῆς περιεχούσης αὐτὸν σφαίρας κωλυόμενον ἄχρι παντὸς εὐθυπορεῖν καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν τροπικῶν κύκλων.

A 59

AËTIUS

σελήνης αὐτὸν ὑπερχομένης.

A 58

The tilt of the heavens; the sun's turning

AËTIUS

Empedocles: the air having yielded to the sun's onrush, the Bears were tilted over, and the northern regions were raised and the southern lowered — and with them the whole cosmos.

AËTIUS

Empedocles: [the sun turns back] because it is prevented by the sphere enclosing it from travelling straight on without end, and by the tropic circles.

Doxographic report, two notices.

The obliquity of the ecliptic is here given a physical history rather than a geometry: the heavens are tilted because something pushed them. Whatever else is true of it, this is a cosmology in which the present arrangement is the outcome of an event.

Bearing on Volume I. Explains the seasons as residue of an accident, not as design.

ἄρκτουζ] the celestial north pole.

A 59

Solar eclipse

AËTIUS

[The sun is eclipsed] when the moon passes beneath it.

Doxographic report, one line.

Correct, and stated without qualification.

A 60

AĒTIUS

Ἐ. ἀέρα συνεστραμμένον, νεφοειδῆ, πεπηγότα ὑπὸ πυρός, ὥστε σύμμικτον.

PLUTARCH, ON THE FACE IN THE MOON

καὶ γὰρ Ἐμπεδοκλεῖ δυσκολαίνουσι πάγον ἀέρος χαλαζώδη ποιοῦντι τὴν σελήνην ὑπὸ τῆς τοῦ πυρὸς σφαίρας περιεχόμενον.

AĒTIUS

δισκοειδῆ.

PLUTARCH, ROMAN QUESTIONS

τὸ γὰρ φαινόμενον σχῆμα τῆς σελήνης, ὅταν ᾗ διχόμενος, οὐ σφαιροειδὲς ἀλλὰ φακοειδὲς ἐστὶ καὶ δισκοειδὲς, ὡς δ' Ἐ. οἶται, καὶ τὸ ὑποκείμενον.

AĒTIUS

Θαλῆς πρῶτος ἔφη ὑπὸ τοῦ ἡλίου φωτίζεσθαι. Πυθαγόρας, Παρμενίδης, Ἐ. ... ὁμοίως.

A 60

The moon — its matter, its shape, its borrowed light

AËTIUS

Empedocles: [the moon is] air compacted, cloud-like, congealed by fire, so that it is a mixture.

PLUTARCH, ON THE FACE IN THE MOON

For they take issue with Empedocles as well, for making the moon a hail-like freezing of air, enclosed by the sphere of fire.

AËTIUS

[The moon is] disc-shaped.

PLUTARCH, ROMAN QUESTIONS

For the apparent shape of the moon, when it is at the half, is not spherical but lentil-shaped and disc-like; and so too, as Empedocles thinks, is the body underlying the appearance.

AËTIUS

Thales was the first to say that it is lit by the sun. Pythagoras, Parmenides, Empedocles ... likewise.

Doxographic report, with two arguing witnesses from Plutarch.

Plutarch is the valuable witness here, because he is arguing rather than cataloguing, and he tells us what the disc-claim meant. Empedocles is not reporting how the moon looks; he holds that the moon is the shape it looks. That is a stronger and stranger position than the doxography's single word conveys, and Plutarch cites it precisely because he finds it hard to defend.

Bearing on Volume I. A case where a later author's argument preserves the sense a handbook entry had lost.

A 61

AETIUS

Ἐ. διπλάσιον ἀπέχειν τὴν σελήνην ἀπὸ τοῦ ἡλίου ἢπερ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς (Plut.). διπλάσιον ἀπέχειν τῆς σελήνης ἀπὸ γῆς ἢπερ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἡλίου (Stob.).

A 62

HIPPOLYTUS, REFUTATION OF ALL HERESIES

ὥσπερ ὁ Ἐ. πάντα τὸν καθ' ἡμᾶς τόπον ἔφη κακῶν μεστὸν εἶναι καὶ μέχρι μὲν σελήνης τὰ κακὰ φθάνειν ἐκ τοῦ περὶ γῆν τόπου ταθέντα, περαιτέρω δὲ μὴ χωρεῖν, ἅτε καθαρωτέρου τοῦ ὑπὲρ τὴν σελήνην παντὸς ὄντος τόπου· οὕτω καὶ τῷ Ἡρακλείτῳ ἔδοξεν.

A 61

The distance of the moon

AËTIUS

Empedocles: the moon is twice as far from the sun as it is from the earth (so the ps.-Plutarch branch); the moon is twice as far from the earth as from the sun (so Stobaeus).

Doxographic report, the two branches in disagreement.

The two branches of the tradition contradict each other, and Diels judges that neither preserves what Empedocles said. The entry is printed here not for its astronomy but as a specimen of how a numerical claim decays in transmission: the figure survives and the terms it relates do not.

Bearing on Volume I. A worked example of what the witness gradient in the headnote describes.

Diels: "it ought to read: the sun is twice as far from the earth as the moon is."

A 62

Evil reaches as far as the moon

HIPPOLYTUS, REFUTATION OF ALL HERESIES

As Empedocles said that the whole region about us is full of evils, and that the evils reach as far as the moon, stretched out from the region around the earth, but go no further, since the whole region above the moon is purer. Heraclitus held the same.

Report from a hostile Christian source, but doctrinally precise.

This is cosmology and doctrine of the soul at the same point. The moon is the boundary of the world of exile described in the Purifications; above it the air is clean. The physics and the religion are not two systems in this man but one, and here the join is visible.

Bearing on Volume I. The clearest testimony that the two poems share a single geography.

A 63

ARISTOTLE, METEOROLOGY

τινὲς λέγουσιν ὥς ἐν τοῖς νέφεσιν ἐγγίνεται πῦρ. τοῦτο δ' ἔ. μέν φησιν εἶναι τὸ ἐμπεριλαμβανόμενον τῶν τοῦ ἡλίου ἀκτίνων.

AËTIUS

ἔ. ἔμπτωσιν φωτὸς εἰς νέφος ἐξείργοντος τὸν ἀνθεστῶτα ἀέρα, οὗ τὴν μὲν σβέειν καὶ τὴν θραύειν κύπον ἀπεργάζεσθαι, τὴν δὲ λάμψιν ἀστραπήν, κεραυνὸν δὲ τὸν τῆς ἀστραπῆς τόνον.

A 64

OLYMPIODORUS, ON ARISTOTLE'S METEOROLOGY

τί τὸ κινεῖν αὐτοὺς λοξὴν κίνησιν; ὅτι οὐ τὸ γεῶδες καὶ τὸ πυρῶδες τὴν ἐναντίαν κινούμενα κίνησιν, ὥς ἔ. ὤιετο, ἀλλ' ὁ κύκλωι κινούμενος ἀήρ.

A 63

Lightning and thunder

ARISTOTLE, METEOROLOGY

Some say that fire comes to be within the clouds. Empedocles says that this fire is what gets caught and held from the sun's rays.

AËTIUS

Empedocles: a falling of light into a cloud, which drives out the air standing against it; the quenching of that air and the shattering of it produce the crash, its flashing produces the lightning, and the thunderbolt is the lightning's force.

Report, Aristotle summarising, Aëtius expanding.

Both witnesses agree on the mechanism, which is that the fire in the cloud is solar fire that was trapped there — not fire generated on the spot. Thunder and lightning are then one event described from two sides, sound and light, differing only in what the air does.

σβέειν is obscure; Diels conjectures σχίσιν, "splitting."

A 64

Why the winds blow slantwise

OLYMPIODORUS, ON ARISTOTLE'S METEOROLOGY

What makes them [the winds] move slantwise? Not the earthy and the fiery moving with contrary motions, as Empedocles supposed, but the air that moves in a circle.

Late scholastic report, reliable only for the attribution.

A late scholastic notice, and reliable only for the bare attribution: Empedocles explained oblique motion by the crossing of two opposite tendencies. The principle is the one that governs his cosmos generally — a resultant produced by two forces pulling different ways.

A 65

AËTIUS

Ἐ. καὶ οἱ Στωικοὶ χειμῶνα μὲν γίνεσθαι τοῦ ἀέρος ἐπικρατοῦντος τῇ πυκνώσει εἰς τὸ ἄνωτέρω βιαζομένου, θερείαν δὲ τοῦ πυρός, ὅταν εἰς τὸ κατωτέρω βιάζεται.

A 66

PHILO, ON PROVIDENCE

deinde ratiocinatus de mari ait: postquam concretum est id quod erat in extremitate orae maxime grandinis more, aqua limosa (facta est). quidquid enim in terra humidi est, in demissis depressisque eius locis a ventis certatim flantibus nexibus quam fortissimis undique comprimi solebat.

AËTIUS

Ἐ. ἰδρῶτα τῆς γῆς ἐκκαιομένης ὑπὸ τοῦ ἡλίου διὰ τὴν ἐπὶ τὸ πλεῖον πίλησιν.

A 65

Winter and summer

AËTIUS

Empedocles and the Stoics: winter comes about when the air prevails, forced upward by condensation; summer when the fire prevails, when it is forced downward.

Doxographic report, compressed to cover two schools at once.

The pairing with the Stoics is the doxographer's, not Empedocles', and it is the reason the notice is hard to read: the sentence has been compressed to fit two systems at once, and the subject of the verb has dropped out.

βιαζομένου] Diels: the subject is the sun, which was doubtless clear from the original context.

A 66

The sea: the sweat of the earth, and the fresh water in it

PHILO, ON PROVIDENCE

Then, reasoning about the sea, he says: after what lay at the outermost edge had congealed, very much in the manner of hail, it became muddy water. For whatever moisture is in the earth used to be squeezed together from every side, in its low and sunken places, by winds blowing in rivalry, with the strongest of bindings.

AËTIUS

Empedocles: [the sea is] the sweat of the earth as it is burnt through by the sun, owing to its ever greater compression.

A 66 (continued)

AEELAN, ON THE NATURE OF ANIMALS

λέγει δὲ Ἀριστοτέλης, καὶ Δημόκριτος πρὸ ἐκείνου, Θεόφραστος τε ἐκ τρίτων καὶ αὐτὸς φησι μὴ τῷ ἄλμυρῳ ὕδατι τρέφεσθαι τοὺς ἰχθυῖς, ἀλλὰ τῷ παρακειμένῳ τῇ θαλάττῃ γλυκεῖ ὕδατι. καὶ ἐπεὶ δοκεῖ πῶς ἄπιστον, δι' αὐτῶν τῶν ἔργων βεβαιῶσαι βουλευθεῖς τὸ λεχθὲν ὁ τοῦ Νικομάχου λέγει εἶναι τι πότιμον ὕδωρ ἐν πάσῃ θαλάττῃ, καὶ ἐλέγχεσθαι τούτῳ· εἴ τις ἀγγεῖον ἐκ κηροῦ ποιήσας κοῖλον καὶ λεπτὸν καθεῖη κενὸν ἐς τὴν θάλατταν, ἐξάψας ποθὲν ὥστε ἀνιμῆσασθαι δύνασθαι, νυκτὸς δὲ διελθούσης καὶ ἡμέρας ἀρύεται πεπλησμένον, γλυκέος τε καὶ ποτίμου ὕδατος μεστὸν αὐτό· καὶ Ἐ. δὲ ὁ Ἀκραγαντίνος λέγει τι εἶναι γλυκὺ ἐν τῇ θαλάττῃ ὕδωρ οὐ πᾶσι δῆλον, τρόφιμον δὲ τῶν ἰχθύων. καὶ τὴν αἰτίαν τοῦδε τοῦ ἐν τῇ ἄλμῃ γλυκαινομένου λέγει φυσικὴν, ἣν ἐκεῖθεν εἴσεσθε.

A 66 (continued)

AELIAN, ON THE NATURE OF ANIMALS

Aristotle says — and Democritus before him, and Theophrastus third — and he himself says that fish are nourished not by the salt water but by the fresh water that lies alongside within the sea. And since this seems somehow past belief, the son of Nicomachus, wishing to confirm what he had said by the facts themselves, says that there is drinkable water in every sea, and that it may be tested thus: if a man makes a hollow, thin vessel out of wax and lets it down empty into the sea, tying it to something so that he can haul it back, then, after a night and a day have passed, he draws it up filled — full of sweet and drinkable water. And Empedocles of Acragas too says that there is a sweet water in the sea, not evident to everyone, but nourishing to the fish. And he gives a natural cause for this sweetening within the brine, which you may learn from his own work.

Report from three witnesses at very different removes.

Three witnesses of quite different kinds sit here together. Philo survives only through an Armenian version rendered into Latin, and is at two removes from anything Empedocles wrote; Aëtius gives a phrase, "the sweat of the earth," that has the ring of the verse; Aelian is reporting an experiment that is not Empedocles' at all, but Aristotle's, and mentions Empedocles because he had reached the same conclusion by another road. The value of the Aelian notice is its last clause: Empedocles gave a physical cause, and Aelian assumes his readers can go and find it.

Bearing on Volume I. The sea is not a given but a residue — something the earth gave off under pressure.

Philo 3 aqua] Heidel conjectures terra; perhaps read aqua limosa (facta est terra).

A 67

ARISTOTLE, ON THE HEAVENS

διὸ δὴ καὶ τὴν γῆν πάντες ὅσοι τὸν οὐρανὸν γεννώσιν ἐπὶ τὸ μέσον συνελθεῖν φασιν. ὅτι δὲ μένει, ζητοῦσι τὴν αἰτίαν καὶ λέγουσιν οἱ μὲν τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον, ὅτι τὸ πλάτος καὶ τὸ μέγεθος αὐτῆς αἷτιον, οἱ δ' ὥσπερ Ἐ. τὴν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ φορὰν κύκλῳ περιθέουσιν καὶ θάττον φερομένην τὴν τῆς γῆς φορὰν κωλύειν καθάπερ τὸ ἐν τοῖς κυάθοις ὕδωρ· καὶ γὰρ τοῦτο κύκλῳ τοῦ κυάθου φερομένου πολλάκις κάτω τοῦ χαλκοῦ γινόμενον ὅμως οὐ φέρεται κάτω πεφυκὸς φέρεσθαι διὰ τὴν αὐτὴν αἰτίαν.

A 67

Why the earth stays where it is

ARISTOTLE, ON THE HEAVENS

This is why all those who generate the heaven say that the earth came together at the centre. As to why it stays there, they look for the cause; some speak in this way, that its breadth and its size are the cause; others, like Empedocles, that the revolution of the heaven, running round in a circle and travelling faster, prevents the earth from travelling — as with the water in ladles. For this too, when the ladle is swung round in a circle, though it often comes to be below the bronze, is nevertheless not carried downward, though it is its nature to be carried downward — and for the same cause.

Report, with Empedocles' own analogy preserved.

The analogy is Empedocles', not Aristotle's, and it is a good one: a bucket of water swung on a rope does not spill at the top. He has identified the phenomenon that will later be called centrifugal, and has used it to answer the hardest question in any cosmology that has the earth unsupported in space.

Bearing on Volume I. Aristotle preserves the argument in order to reject it; his own answer is natural place.

295a22 τῆν] ἢ τῆν in the manuscripts EF.

A 68

SENECA, NATURAL QUESTIONS

E. existimat ignibus, quos multis locis terra opertos tegit, aquam calescere, si subiecti sunt ei solo, per quod aquis transcursus est. facere solemus dracones et miliaria et complures formas, in quibus aere tenui fistulas struimus per declive circumdatas, ut saepe eundem ignem ambiens aqua per tantum fluat spatii quantum efficiendo calori sat est; frigida itaque intrat, effluit calida. idem sub terra E. existimat fieri.

A 68

Fires under the earth, and hot springs

SENECA, NATURAL QUESTIONS

Empedocles holds that water is heated by the fires which the earth covers and keeps hidden in many places, if they lie beneath the very ground through which the waters have their passage. We are in the habit of making coiled heaters and water-boilers and several kinds of apparatus, in which we construct pipes of thin bronze, laid round on a slope, so that the water, circling the same fire again and again, may flow through as much space as is enough to produce the heat; it therefore goes in cold and comes out hot. Empedocles holds that the same thing happens under the earth.

Report, explained by way of a Roman appliance.

Seneca is explaining an ancient theory by means of a Roman appliance, and the appliance is what makes the notice valuable: the point of the comparison is length of contact, not mere proximity. Water is not hot because fire is near it, but because it has run a long way beside fire.

26 ei Haase: et Φ : omitted in ΔT . — 28 circumlatas or circumductas Gercke.

A 69

PSEUDO-ARISTOTLE, PROBLEMS

διὰ τί ὑπὸ τῶν θερμῶν ὑδάτων μᾶλλον ἢ ὑπὸ τῶν ψυχρῶν πηγνυνται λίθοι; πότερον ὅτι τῇ τοῦ ὑγροῦ ἐκλείψει γίνεται λίθος, μᾶλλον δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ θερμοῦ ἢ τοῦ ψυχροῦ ἐκλείπει τὸ ὑγρόν· καὶ ἀπολιθοῦται δὴ διὰ τὸ θερμόν, καθάπερ καὶ Ἐ. φησι τάς τε πέτρας καὶ τοὺς λίθους καὶ τὰ θερμὰ τῶν ὑδάτων γίνεσθαι.

PSSELLUS, ON STONES

τούτων δὲ τῶν παρὰ τοῖς λίθοις δυνάμεων (τάς) αἰτίας πολλοὶ ἐθάρρησαν ἀποδοῦναι, τῶν μὲν ἀρχαιοτέρων σοφῶν Ἀναξαγόρας καὶ Ἐ. καὶ Δημόκριτος, τῶν δὲ οὐ πολὺ πρὸ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐκ τῆς Ἀφροdisίας Ἀλέξανδρος.

PLUTARCH, ON THE PRINCIPLE OF COLD

ταυτὶ δὲ τὰ ἐμφανῇ κρημνοὺς καὶ σκοπέλους καὶ πέτρας Ἐ. μὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ πυρὸς οἶεται τοῦ ἐν βάθει τῆς γῆς ἐστάναι καὶ ἀνέχεσθαι διεριδόμενα φλεγμαίνοντος.

A 69

How stone is made

PSEUDO-ARISTOTLE, PROBLEMS

Why are stones formed by hot waters rather than by cold? Is it because stone comes to be by the departure of what is moist, and the moist departs more under heat than under cold? So a thing is turned to stone through heat — just as Empedocles too says that rocks and stones and the hot springs come to be.

PSSELLUS, ON STONES

Many have ventured to assign the causes of these powers that reside in stones: among the older sages Anaxagoras and Empedocles and Democritus, and among those not long before our own time Alexander of Aphrodisias.

PLUTARCH, ON THE PRINCIPLE OF COLD

These visible things — cliffs and crags and rocks — Empedocles thinks stand firm and are held up, braced from beneath, by the fire that blazes in the depth of the earth.

Report from the Peripatetic school, with two later echoes.

The attribution to "Aristotle" is nominal: the Problems are a later compilation of the school, and the notice carries the school's authority rather than his. Psellus, writing in the eleventh century and placing Alexander of Aphrodisias "not long before our own time," shows how far the chain of transmission had by then been foreshortened.

Bearing on Volume I. Rock is water that has lost its moisture to fire — the whole of geology on one principle.

36 (τὰς) supplied by Diels.

A 69a

THEOPHRASTUS, ON THE SENSES

Ἐ. δὲ καὶ περὶ τῶν χρωμάτων, καὶ ὅτι τὸ μὲν λευκὸν τοῦ πυρός, τὸ δὲ μέλαν τοῦ ὕδατος.

A 69a

White and black

THEOPHRASTUS, ON THE SENSES

Empedocles also speaks about colours, and says that white belongs to fire and black to water.

Report, one sentence from the best-informed witness in the collection.

Theophrastus adds this almost as an afterthought, and it is the shortest possible statement of the principle: a colour is not a quality of a thing but the presence in it of a root. Two roots are named here; what the other two contributed we are not told.

Bearing on Volume I. Connects the physics of the four roots directly to the theory of perception that follows in A 86.

Compare fragment B 94.

A 70

AETIUS

Ἐ. πρῶτα τὰ δένδρα τῶν ζώων ἐκ γῆς ἀναφῦναί φησι, πρὶν τὸν ἥλιον περιπλωθῆναι καὶ πρὶν ἡμέραν καὶ νύκτα διακριθῆναι· διὰ δὲ συμμετρίας τῆς κράσεως τὸν τοῦ ἄρρενος καὶ τοῦ θήλεος περιέχειν λόγον. αὐξέσθαι δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐν τῇ γῇ θερμοῦ διαιρόμενα, ὥστε γῆς εἶναι μέρη καθάπερ καὶ τὰ ἔμβρυα τὰ ἐν τῇ γαστρὶ τῆς μήτρας μέρη· τοὺς δὲ καρποὺς περιττώματα εἶναι τοῦ ἐν τοῖς φυτοῖς ὕδατος καὶ πυρός· καὶ τὰ μὲν ἐλλιπὲς ἔχοντα τὸ ὑγρὸν ἐξικμαζομένου αὐτοῦ τῷ θέρει φυλλορροεῖν, τὰ δὲ πλεῖον, παραμένειν, ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τῆς δάφνης καὶ τῆς ἐλαίας καὶ τοῦ φοίνικος· τὰς δὲ διαφορὰς τῶν χυμῶν (παρὰ) παραλλαγὰς τῆς (γῆς) πολυμερείας καὶ τῶν φυτῶν γίνεσθαι διαφόρως ἐλκόντων τὰς ἀπὸ τοῦ τρέφοντος ὁμοιομερείας ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀμπέλων· οὐ γὰρ αἱ διαφοραὶ τούτων χρηστὸν τὸν οἶνον ποιοῦσιν, ἀλλ' αἱ τοῦ τρέφοντος ἐδάφους.

THEOPHRASTUS, ON THE CAUSES OF PLANTS

ἐν γάρ τι τὸ γεννῶν οὐχ ὥσπερ Ἐ. διαιρεῖ καὶ μερίζει τὴν μὲν γῆν εἰς τὰς ρίζας, τὸν δ' αἰθέρα εἰς τοὺς βλαστοὺς ὡς ἐκάτερον ἐκατέρου χωριζόμενον, ἀλλ' ἐκ μιᾶς ὕλης καὶ ὑφ' ἐνὸς αἰτίου γεννῶντος.

ARISTOTLE, ON THE SOUL

Ἐ. δ' οὐ καλῶς εἶρηκε τοῦτο προστιθεὶς τὴν αὐξήσιν συμβαίνειν τοῖς φυτοῖς κάτω μὲν συρριζομένοις διὰ τὸ τὴν γῆν οὕτω φέρεσθαι κατὰ φύσιν, ἄνω δὲ διὰ τὸ πῦρ ὡσαύτως.

PLUTARCH, TABLE TALK

τηρεῖται δὲ τοῖς μὲν φυτοῖς ἀναισθήτως ἐκ τοῦ περιέχοντος, ὥς φησιν Ἐ., ὕδρευομένοις τὸ πρόσφορον.

A 70

Plants — the first living things

AËTIUS

Empedocles says that trees were the first of living things to spring up out of the earth, before the sun had been spread round, and before day and night had been separated; and that through the due proportion of their mixture they contain the principle of both male and female. They grow by being lifted up by the heat within the earth, so that they are parts of the earth, just as embryos in the belly are parts of the womb. Fruits are the surplus of the water and the fire in plants. Those that have too little moisture shed their leaves when it is dried out of them in summer; those that have more of it keep them — as with the bay and the olive and the palm. The differences of flavours arise from variations in the manifold composition of the earth, and because plants draw in different ways the like-parted stuffs from what feeds them — as with vines: for it is not the differences among the vines that make the wine good, but the differences of the soil that feeds them.

THEOPHRASTUS, ON THE CAUSES OF PLANTS

For what generates is some one thing — not, as Empedocles divides and parcels it out, earth going to the roots and aether to the shoots, each separated off from the other, but generating out of one matter and by one cause.

ARISTOTLE, ON THE SOUL

Empedocles has not put this well, in adding that growth happens to plants downward as they take root, because earth naturally travels that way, and upward likewise because of fire.

PLUTARCH, TABLE TALK

In plants [their nature] is kept up without sensation, as Empedocles says, since they draw off from what surrounds them the water that suits them.

A 70 (continued)

NICOLAUS OF DAMASCUS, ON PLANTS

Anaxagoras autem et Abrucalis desiderio eas moveri dicunt, sentire quoque et tristari delectarique asserunt ... Abr. autem sexum in his permixtum opinatus est. — Anaxagoras autem et Democritus et Abr. illas intellectum intellegentiamque habere dicebant. — quod dixit Abr. videlicet si invenitur in plantis sexus femineus et sexus masculinus sive species commixta ex his duobus sexubus. — dixitque Abr. quod plantae habent generationem, mundo tamen diminuto et non perfecto in complemento suo; et eo completo generabatur animal.

A 70 (continued)

NICOLAUS OF DAMASCUS, ON PLANTS

Anaxagoras and Abrucalis say that plants are moved by desire, and assert that they also have sensation and feel pain and pleasure ... Abrucalis moreover held that sex is mingled in them. — Anaxagoras and Democritus and Abrucalis used to say that they possess intellect and understanding. — What Abrucalis said, namely, whether there is found in plants a female sex and a male sex, or a kind mingled out of these two sexes. — And Abrucalis said that plants have generation while the world was still diminished and not complete in its fulness; and when it had been completed, the animal was generated.

Report from five witnesses, the last at four removes through Arabic.

This is the longest testimony in the volume, and it travels furthest. The last witness is a treatise that passed from Greek into Syriac, from Syriac into Arabic, from Arabic into Latin, and it calls Empedocles by a name no Greek would recognise. Yet its content is not fanciful: that plants desire, feel, and possess a sex is exactly what the Aëtius notice says in Greek, and B 79 gives it in verse. The two ends of the transmission agree, and it is only the middle that is illegible. The Theophrastus and Aristotle notices are objections, and both object to the same thing — that Empedocles explained a plant's shape by the downward tendency of earth and the upward tendency of fire, so that a tree is not a single organism growing but two opposed motions held in one body.

Bearing on Volume I. Empedocles' plants are alive in the full sense: they desire, they perceive, and they have sex. They are also older than the sun.

Aët. 2 περιπλωθῆναι] an unclear expression, "spread itself round the celestial sphere"; Reiske conjectures περικυκλωθῆναι. — 4 διαρούμενα Diels: διαρούμενα G: διαρουμένου AC: άραιουμένου B. — 9 (παρά) and (γῆς) supplied by Diels. — 11 χρηστὸν τὸν Diels: χρηστικὸν ABC. — "Abrucalis" is the Arabic rendering of Empedocles' name; elsewhere in the Arabic tradition the same form stands for Protagoras or Herophilus.

A 71

HIPPOCRATES, ON ANCIENT MEDICINE

λέγουσι δέ τινες ἰητροὶ καὶ σοφισταί, ὥς οὐκ εἴη δυνατόν ἱητρικὴν εἰδέναι ὅστις μὴ οἶδεν ὃ τί ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος, ἀλλὰ τοῦτο δεῖ καταμαθεῖν τὸν μέλλοντα ὀρθῶς θεραπεύσειν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. τείνει δὲ αὐτοῖς ὁ λόγος ἐς φιλοσοφίην, καθάπερ Ἐ. ἢ ἄλλοι, οἱ περὶ φύσιος γεγράφασιν (φασίν), ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὃ τί ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος καὶ ὅπως ἐγένετο πρῶτον καὶ ὁπόθεν συνεπάγη· ἐγὼ δὲ τοῦτο μὲν, ὅσα τινὲς εἴρηται ἢ σοφιστῇ ἢ ἱητρῶι ἢ γέγραπται περὶ φύσιος, ἥσσον νομίζω τῇ ἱητρικῇ τέχνῃ προσήκειν ἢ τῇ γραφικῇ. νομίζω δὲ περὶ φύσιος γινῶναι τι σαφὲς οὐδαμῶθεν ἄλλοθεν εἶναι ἢ ἐξ ἱητρικῆς.

A 71

Medicine and the study of nature

HIPPOCRATES, ON ANCIENT MEDICINE

Certain physicians and sophists say that no one can know medicine who does not know what man is, and that whoever intends to treat men rightly must first learn this. Their argument runs off into philosophy — as Empedocles, or others who have written about nature, say: what man is from the beginning, and how he first came to be, and out of what he was compounded. For my part, I hold that whatever has been said or written about nature, by sophist or physician, belongs less to the art of medicine than to the art of painting. And I hold that there is no source from which anything clear can be known about nature except medicine itself.

Reception: the earliest surviving criticism of Empedocles.

This is the oldest surviving criticism of Empedocles, written within living memory of him and possibly within his lifetime, and it is an attack on a method rather than on a doctrine. The author does not say that Empedocles is wrong about what man is; he says that the question is out of place — that a physician who begins from the origin of the cosmos has begun in the wrong century. The last sentence turns the claim around: not that medicine needs no natural philosophy, but that natural philosophy, if it is to be got at all, will be got from medicine.

Bearing on Volume I. Empedocles is named here as the type of a whole way of proceeding, which shows how early and how completely he stood for it.

33 {φασίν} supplied by Diels, who alternatively brackets οἱ. — 35 ἢ τῇ γραφικῇ deleted by Ehlert.

A 72

AËTIUS

Ἐ. τὰς πρώτας γενέσεις τῶν ζώων καὶ φυτῶν μηδαμῶς ὀλοκλήρους γενέσθαι, ἀσυμφυέσι δὲ τοῖς μορίοις διεζευγμέναις, τὰς δὲ δευτέρας συμφυομένων τῶν μερῶν εἰδωλοφανεῖς, τὰς δὲ τρίτας τῶν ὀλοφυῶν, τὰς δὲ τετάρτας οὐκέτι ἐκ τῶν ὁμοίων οἶον ἐκ γῆς καὶ ὕδατος, ἀλλὰ δι' ἀλλήλων ἤδη, τοῖς μὲν πυκνωθείσης τῆς τροφῆς, τοῖς δὲ καὶ τῆς εὐμορφίας τῶν γυναικῶν ἐπερεθισμὸν τοῦ σπερματικοῦ κινήματος ἐμποιησάσης· τῶν δὲ ζώων πάντων τὰ γένη διακριθῆναι διὰ τὰς ποιὰς κράσεις· τὰ μὲν οἰκειότεραν εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ τὴν ὁρμὴν ἔχειν, τὰ δὲ εἰς ἀέρα ἀναπτῆναι, ὅς' ἂν πυρῶδες ἔχῃ τὸ πλέον, τὰ δὲ βαρύτερα ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, τὰ δὲ ἰσόμοιρα τῇ κράσει πᾶσι τοῖς θώραξι πεφωνηκέναι.

CENSORINUS, ON THE BIRTHDAY

E. autem egregio suo carmine ... tale quiddam confirmat. primo membra singula ex terra quasi praegnate passim edita, deinde coisse et effecisse solidi hominis materiam igni simul et umori permixtam.

A 72

The four generations of living things

AËTIUS

Empedocles: the first generations of animals and plants were in no way complete, but were disjointed, their parts not grown together; the second, as the parts grew together, were phantom-like; the third were of the whole-natured kinds; the fourth came no longer out of the like stuffs, such as earth and water, but now through one another — in some cases because the nourishment had been condensed, in others because the beauty of women had produced an excitement of the seminal motion. The kinds of all animals were distinguished by their particular mixtures: some had the impulse more at home in water; others, those with the larger share of fire, flew up into the air; the heavier went to the earth; and those of balanced mixture were in accord with every region.

CENSORINUS, ON THE BIRTHDAY

Empedocles, in that excellent poem of his, maintains something of this kind: first, single limbs were put forth here and there out of the earth as though it were pregnant; then they came together and made up the material of a solid man, mingled at once of fire and of moisture.

A 72 (continued)

VARRO, EUMENIDES

E. natos homines ex terra ait ut blitum.

A 73

ARISTOTLE, ON RESPIRATION

Ἐ. δ' οὐ καλῶς τοῦτ' εἶρηκε φάσκων τὰ θερμότεα καὶ πῦρ ἔχοντα
πλεῖστον τῶν ζώων ἔνυδρα εἶναι φεύγοντα τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τῆς ἐν
τῇ φύσει θερμότητος.

THEOPHRASTUS, ON THE CAUSES OF PLANTS

ὥσπερ καὶ Ἐ. λέγει περὶ τῶν ζώων· τὰ γὰρ ὑπέρπυρα τὴν φύσιν
ἄγειν εἰς τὸ ὑγρόν.

A 72 (continued)

VARRO, EUMENIDES

Empedocles says that men grew out of the earth like a garden herb.

Report, confirmed independently by a reader of the poem.

The four stages are the most famous thing in Empedocles after the four roots, and the sequence is strictly evolutionary in form while being nothing like Darwin in content. Scattered limbs; then those limbs joined into shapes that are seemings rather than animals; then whole-natured creatures, undifferentiated and without sex; and only in the fourth stage generation of like from like, which is the world we live in. Sexual reproduction is thus the latest thing in nature, not the first. Censorinus, who read the poem, confirms the first stage independently, and Varro's one contemptuous line shows the doctrine had passed into the currency of educated Rome.

Bearing on Volume I. The scattered limbs of stage one are what B 57 and B 58 describe in verse.

4 ὁμοίων is probably corrupt; Reiske conjectures οἰκείων, Gomperz ὁμοστοίχων, Diels ὁμοιομερῶν. — 5 the words τοῖς δὲ καὶ τοῖς ζώοις are deleted as a scholion. — 7 οἰκειότεραν Dübner: οἰκειότερα in the manuscripts. — 8 ἀναπτῆναι ὅσ' ἔν Diels: ἀναπνεῖν ἕως ἔν in the manuscripts. — 9 the closing words are corrupt in all manuscripts; the rendering follows Diels's π. τοῖς χωρίοις σύμφωνά εἶναι.

A 73

Why the hottest animals live in water

ARISTOTLE, ON RESPIRATION

Empedocles has not put this well, in asserting that the hottest of animals, those having most fire, are water-dwellers, fleeing the excess of the heat in their own nature.

THEOPHRASTUS, ON THE CAUSES OF PLANTS

As Empedocles too says about animals: for what is over-fiery in nature is led toward the moist.

Report, in both witnesses given in order to be corrected.

The principle is compensation, not likeness: a creature seeks the element it lacks, or flees the one it has too much of. It is the same principle that makes the fourth root the corrective of the third throughout the physiology, and it is the reason the doctrine sounds backwards on first hearing — the hottest animals are in the coldest place because they are the hottest.

A 74

AËTIUS

Ἐ. τὴν πρώτην ἀναπνοὴν τοῦ πρώτου ζώου γενέσθαι τῆς <μὲν> ἐν τοῖς βρέφεσιν ὑγρασίας ἀποχώρησιν λαμβανούσης, πρὸς δὲ τὸ παρακενωθὲν ἐπεισόδου τοῦ ἐκτὸς ἀερῶδους γινομένης εἰς τὰ παρανοιχθέντα τῶν ἀγγείων· τὸ δὲ μετὰ τοῦτο ἤδη τοῦ ἐμφύτου θερμοῦ τῇ πρὸς τὸ ἐκτὸς ὁρμῇ τὸ ἀερῶδες ὑπαναθλίβοντος τὴν ἐκπνοήν, τῇ δ' εἰς τὸ ἐντὸς ἀνθυποχωρήσει τῷ ἀερῶδει τὴν ἀντεπείσοδον παρεχομένου τὴν εἰσπνοήν. τὴν δὲ νῦν κατέχουσιν φερομένου τοῦ αἵματος ὥς πρὸς τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν καὶ τὸ ἀερῶδες διὰ τῶν ῥινῶν ταῖς ἑαυτοῦ ἐπιρροαῖς ἀναθλίβοντος κατὰ τὴν ἐκχώρησιν αὐτοῦ γίνεσθαι τὴν ἐκπνοήν, παλινδρομοῦντος δὲ καὶ τοῦ ἀέρος ἀντεπεισιόντος εἰς τὰ διὰ τοῦ αἵματος ἀραιώματα τὴν εἰσπνοήν· ὑπομμνήσκει δὲ τὸ ἐπὶ τῆς κλειψύδρας.

A 74

The first breath, and how breathing works now

AËTIUS

Empedocles: the first breath of the first living thing came about when the moisture in the newborn creatures was withdrawing, and, into the space so left empty, an entry of the outer airy stuff took place through the vessels that had been opened. After this, the innate heat, rushing toward the outside, presses the airy stuff out — and that is exhalation; and by yielding back toward the inside it gives the airy stuff its counter-entry — and that is inhalation. But the breathing that now prevails comes about thus: the blood travels toward the surface, and by its own inflows presses out the airy stuff through the nostrils, so that as the blood gives way exhalation occurs; and when the blood runs back again and the air enters in turn into the spaces the blood has left thin, inhalation occurs. He recalls in this connection the case of the water-clock.

Doxographic report, summarising an argument the poem gives in full.

Breathing here is not something the lungs do; it is something the blood does, and the nostrils are incidental to it. The blood advances to the surface and drives the air out; the blood retreats and the air follows it in. The account is wrong, and it is wrong in an instructive way: it treats the body as a hydraulic system in which nothing is ever empty, which is exactly the assumption behind the water-clock experiment of B 100 — the longest continuous passage of Empedocles we possess, and the only ancient description of a controlled demonstration in verse.

Bearing on Volume I. The doctrine and the poem meet here; B 100 is the argument this notice summarises.

21 (μὲν) supplied by Diels. — 22 τῆς ἔξωθεν deleted by Diels. — 25 ἐντός Bernadakis: ἐκτός in the manuscripts. — 30 τό Diels: αὐτό in the manuscripts. Diels notes that the parallel report at Aëtius V 15, 3 is inferior.

A 75

AĒTIUS

Ἐ. ὅτε ἐγεννᾶτο τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένος ἐκ τῆς γῆς, τοσαύτην γενέσθαι τῷ μήκει τοῦ χρόνου διὰ τὸ βραδυπορεῖν τὸν ἥλιον τὴν ἡμέραν, ὅποση νῦν ἐστὶν ἡ δεκάμηνος· προϊόντος δὲ τοῦ χρόνου, τοσαύτην γενέσθαι τὴν ἡμέραν, ὅποση νῦν ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπτάμηνος· διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τὰ δεκάμηνα καὶ τὰ ἐπτάμηνα, τῆς φύσεως τοῦ κόσμου οὕτω μεμελετηκίας, αὔξεσθαι ἐν μιᾷ ἡμέρᾳ ἢ τίκτεται τὸ βρέφος.

A 75

Why both ten-month and seven-month children live

AËTIUS

Empedocles: when the human race was being generated out of the earth, the day — because the sun travelled slowly — was as long as a ten-month term is now; and as time went on the day became as long as a seven-month term is now. This is why both ten-month and seven-month children are viable: the nature of the cosmos having so practised it, the infant completes its growth in a single day, the day on which it is born.

Doxographic report, the text probably damaged.

A difficult and probably garbled notice, but its premise is not garbled: the length of a day has changed since the world began, because the sun once moved more slowly. Gestation is measured against a day that is no longer the same length, and the two viable terms are fossils of two earlier days.

Bearing on Volume I. Continuous with A 58 and A 64: the present arrangement of the heavens is a late stage of something that was once otherwise.

ὁ τίκτεται Diels, deleting νυκτί: the manuscripts read τίθεται νυκτί; Casaubon conjectured τικτεται νυκτί.

A 76

PLATO, PHAEDO

ἐγὼ γάρ, ἔφη, ὦ Κέβης, νέος ὢν θαυμαστῶς ὥς ἐπεθύμησα ταύτης τῆς σοφίας, ἣν δὴ καλοῦσι περὶ φύσεως ἱστορίαν. ὑπερήφανος γάρ μοι ἐδόκει εἶναι εἰδέναι τὰς αἰτίας ἑκάστου, διὰ τί γίγνεται ἕκαστον καὶ διὰ τί ἀπόλλυται καὶ διὰ τί ἐστίν. καὶ πολλάκις ἑμαυτὸν ἄνω κάτω μετέβαλλον σκοπῶν πρῶτον τὰ τοιάδε· ἄρ' ἐπειδὴν τὸ θερμὸν καὶ ψυχρὸν σηπεδόνα τινὰ λάβηι, ὥς τινες ἔλεγον, τότε δὴ τὰ ζῶια συντρέφεται; καὶ πότερον τὸ αἷμά ἐστιν ὧι φρονοῦμεν ἢ ὁ ἀήρ ἢ τὸ πῦρ; ἢ τούτων μὲν οὐδέν, ὁ δ' ἐγκέφαλός ἐστιν;

A 76

Socrates recalls the questions of natural philosophy

PLATO, PHAEDO

"When I was young, Cebes," he said, "I had a wonderful desire for that wisdom they call inquiry into nature. It seemed to me a splendid thing to know the causes of each thing — why each comes to be, and why it perishes, and why it is. And often I would turn myself upside down considering, first, questions like these. Is it when the hot and the cold take on a kind of putrefaction, as some used to say, that living things are nourished into being? And is it with blood that we think, or with air, or with fire? Or none of these, but the brain?"

Reception: Plato, without naming him.

Socrates names no one, but the ancient readers supplied the names, and Diels prints their identifications: the putrefaction is Empedocles' (compare A 77 and B 68), the blood is Empedocles' (B 105), the air is Anaximenes' and Diogenes', the fire Heraclitus', the brain Alcmaeon's. The passage is here because it is a portrait of a whole intellectual generation from the inside, and of what it felt like to give it up. Plato's Socrates does not refute these men; he says he could not make the questions come out.

Bearing on Volume I. The most widely read paragraph in Greek about the natural philosophy this volume documents.

11 ψυχρόν] Sprengel conjectures ὑγρόν, but compare Doxographi 564, 3. — σηπεδόνα] compare fragment B 68.

A 77

AËTIUS

Ἐ. τρέφεσθαι μὲν τὰ ζῶια διὰ τὴν ὑπόστασιν τοῦ οἰκείου, αὔξεσθαι δὲ διὰ τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ θερμοῦ, μειοῦσθαι δὲ καὶ φθίνειν διὰ τὴν ἔκλειψιν ἐκατέρων. τοὺς δὲ νῦν ἀνθρώπους τοῖς πρώτοις συμβαλλομένους βρεφῶν ἐπέχειν τάξιν.

PSEUDO-GALEN, MEDICAL DEFINITIONS

πῶς Ἱπποκράτης καὶ Ἐρασίστρατος καὶ Ἐ. καὶ Ἀσκληπιάδης τὰς πέψεις τῆς τροφῆς φασι γίνεσθαι ... Ἐ. δὲ σήψει.

A 77

Nourishment, growth, and digestion

AËTIUS

Empedocles: living things are nourished by the settling in of what is akin to them, grow by the presence of heat, and are diminished and waste away by the failing of both. And men as they now are, set beside the first men, hold the rank of infants.

PSEUDO-GALEN, MEDICAL DEFINITIONS

How do Hippocrates and Erasistratus and Empedocles and Asclepiades say that the digestion of food comes about? ... Empedocles: by putrefaction.

Doxographic report, with a medical handbook echo.

The last sentence is the striking one and it is easy to read past. Present-day men, measured against the first, are infants — not fallen, not degenerate, but immature. Taken with A 72 and A 75 it gives a cosmos still in the middle of its growth, in which the human race is younger than it looks.

17 οἰκείου] compare πρόσφορον at p. 212, 19; Diels suggests ὑποῦ. Compare fragments B 68 and B 81.

A 78

AETIUS

Ἐ. τὰς μὲν σάρκας γεννᾶσθαι ἐκ τῶν ἴσων τῇ κράσει τεττάρων στοιχείων, τὰ δὲ νεῦρα πυρὸς καὶ γῆς ὕδατι διπλασίονι μιχθέντων, τοὺς δὲ ὄνυχας τοῖς ζώοις γεννᾶσθαι τῶν νεύρων καθ' ὃ τῷ ἀέρι συνέτυχε περιψυχθέντων, ὅσῳ δὲ δεῖν μὲν ὕδατος καὶ γῆς, τεττάρων δὲ πυρός, ἔσω γῆς τούτων συγκραθέντων μερῶν. ἰδρώτα <δὲ> καὶ δάκρυον γίνεσθαι τοῦ αἵματος τηκομένου καὶ παρὰ τὸ λεπτύνεσθαι διαχεομένου.

ARISTOTLE, ON THE PARTS OF ANIMALS

ἀρχὴ γὰρ ἡ φύσις μᾶλλον τῆς ὕλης, ἐνιαχοῦ δὲ που αὐτῇ καὶ Ἐ. περιπίπτει, ἀγόμενος ὑπ' αὐτῆς τῆς ἀληθείας, καὶ τὴν οὐσίαν καὶ τὴν φύσιν ἀναγκάζεται φάναι τὸν λόγον εἶναι, οἷον ὅστουν ἀποδιδούς τί ἐστίν· οὔτε γὰρ ἐν τι τῶν στοιχείων λέγει αὐτὸ οὔτε δύο ἢ τρία οὔτε πάντα, ἀλλὰ λόγον τῆς μίξεως αὐτῶν.

ARISTOTLE, ON THE SOUL

ὁμοίως δὲ ἄτοπον καὶ <τὸ> τὸν λόγον τῆς μίξεως εἶναι τὴν ψυχὴν· οὐ γὰρ τὸν αὐτὸν ἔχει λόγον ἢ μίξις τῶν στοιχείων καθ' ἣν σὰρξ καὶ καθ' ἣν ὅστουν· συμβήσεται οὖν πολλὰς τε ψυχὰς ἔχειν καὶ κατὰ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα, εἴπερ πάντα μὲν ἐκ τῶν στοιχείων μεμειγμένων, ὃ δὲ τῆς μίξεως λόγος ἀρμονία καὶ ψυχὴ.

ARISTOTLE, ON THE SOUL

ἕκαστον γὰρ αὐτῶν λόγῳ τινὶ φησιν εἶναι· πότερον οὖν ὁ λόγος ἐστὶν ἡ ψυχὴ, ἢ μᾶλλον ἕτερόν τι οὐσα ἐγγίνεται τοῖς μέλεσι; ἔτι δὲ πότερον ἡ Φιλία τῆς τυχούσης αἰτία μίξεως ἢ τῆς κατὰ τὸν λόγον; καὶ αὕτη πότερον ὁ λόγος ἐστὶν ἢ παρὰ τὸν λόγον ἕτερόν τι;

PSEUDO-ARISTOTLE, ON BREATH

Ἐ. αἰτίαν ἀπλῶς τὴν τοῦ ὅστοῦ φύσιν. <ἔτι δὲ> εἴπερ ἅπαντα τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον ἔχει τῆς μίξεως, ἀδιάφορα ἐχρῆν ἵππου καὶ λέοντος καὶ ἀνθρώπου εἶναι.

A 78

Flesh, sinew, bone — the doctrine of ratio

AËTIUS

Empedocles: flesh is generated from the four elements equal in their mixture; sinew from fire and earth mixed with twice as much water; the nails of animals are generated from sinews chilled at the point where they met the air; bone from two parts of water and of earth and four of fire, these parts blended together within the earth. Sweat and tears come about from the blood melting, and, as it is thinned, dispersing.

ARISTOTLE, ON THE PARTS OF ANIMALS

For nature is a starting-point more than matter is; and here and there Empedocles too stumbles upon this, led by the truth itself, and is forced to say that the being and the nature of a thing is its ratio — as when he gives his account of what bone is. For he does not say bone is any one of the elements, nor two or three of them, nor all of them, but the ratio of their mixture.

ARISTOTLE, ON THE SOUL

It is equally absurd that the soul should be the ratio of the mixture. For the mixture of the elements by which flesh comes to be does not have the same ratio as that by which bone does. It will follow that a creature has many souls, and has them all over its body — if indeed all its parts are made of the elements mixed, and the ratio of the mixture is harmony and soul.

ARISTOTLE, ON THE SOUL

For he says that each of them exists by a certain ratio. Is the ratio, then, the soul? Or is the soul rather something else, which comes to be present in the limbs? And further: is Love the cause of any chance mixture, or of the mixture that accords with the ratio? And is Love herself the ratio, or something other than the ratio?

PSEUDO-ARISTOTLE, ON BREATH

Empedocles gives, quite simply, the nature of bone as the cause. And further: if all things have the same ratio of mixture, then horse and lion and man would have to be indistinguishable.

A 78 (continued)

PLUTARCH, NATURAL QUESTIONS

ἔνιοι δέ φασιν ὥσπερ γάλακτος ὀρρὸν τοῦ αἵματος παραχθέντος
ἐκκρούεσθαι τὸ δάκρυον, ὡς ἔ.

A 79

SORANUS, GYNAECOLOGY

συγκέκριται δ' ἐκ τεττάρων τὸν ἀριθμὸν ἀγγείων, δύο φλεβῶδων καὶ
δύο ἀρτηριῶδων, δι' ὧν εἰς θρέψιν ὕλη αἱματική καὶ πνευματική
παρακομίζεται τοῖς ἐμβρύοις. ἐμφύεσθαι δὲ ταῦτα Ἐμπεδοκλῆς μὲν
εἰς τὸ ἥπαρ οἶεται, Φαῖδρος δὲ εἰς τὴν καρδίαν.

A 78 (continued)

PLUTARCH, NATURAL QUESTIONS

Some say that the tear is knocked out of the blood when the blood is disturbed, as whey is out of milk — Empedocles among them.

Report, with Aristotle conceding the point in two works.

This is the most important doctrinal testimony in the volume, and the reason is in Aristotle's first sentence rather than in Aëtius' figures. Bone is not fire, nor earth, nor all four; bone is a proportion. What makes a thing the thing it is, on this view, is a number — and Aristotle, who disagrees with nearly everything else here, concedes that on this point Empedocles was "led by the truth itself." The second Aristotle passage then turns the doctrine against itself: if soul is the ratio of a mixture, and flesh and bone have different ratios, a body must have as many souls as it has kinds of tissue.

Bearing on Volume I. The ratio for bone is given in verse at B 96; this notice and that fragment are the same doctrine in the two registers.

22 ἴσων Wyttenbach: ἔσω in the manuscripts. — 23 καὶ γῆς ὕδατι from Galen and B: γῆς τὰ in ABC; διπλασίονι Bernadakis. — 25 δεῖν Wyttenbach: δοκεῖ in the manuscripts; the whole clause reconstructed by Diels after fragment B 96. — 26 (δέ) and the closing words supplied by Diels from Galen, the manuscripts being corrupt and mutilated. — 32 (τό) supplied by Diels.

A 79

The vessels of the navel

SORANUS, GYNAECOLOGY

[The navel] is compounded of four vessels in number, two of the venous kind and two of the arterial, through which material of blood and of breath is conveyed to embryos for their nourishment. Empedocles thinks that these are implanted into the liver, Phaedrus that they go to the heart.

Report from a practising physician.

Soranus is a working obstetrician of the second century and the best medical witness in the collection: he cites Empedocles not as a curiosity but as a position still worth listing beside a contemporary's. That the umbilical vessels run to the liver is what he is credited with, and it is nearly right.

10 ἀρτηριωδῶν H. Schoene: ἀρτηριῶν in the manuscripts. — 12 Phaedrus is otherwise unknown.

A 80

SORANUS, GYNAECOLOGY

ἔστι γὰρ ὅτε καὶ προπαραλαμβάνει τινὰς ἡμέρας ἢ ἐφυστερεῖ. τοῦτο δὲ ἐν ἐκάστη κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν ἀπαντᾷ προθεσμίαν καὶ οὐ<κ ἀεὶ> κατὰ τὰς αὐτὰς <περιόδους>, ὥσπερ ὁ Διοκλῆς φησι πάσαις, καὶ πάλιν Έ., ἐλαττουμένου τοῦ φωτὸς τῆς σελήνης. αἱ μὲν γὰρ πρὸ εἰκάδος αἱ δὲ ἐν εἰκάδι καθαίρονται, καὶ πάλιν αἱ μὲν αὐξανομένου τοῦ φωτὸς τῆς σελήνης αἱ δὲ μειουμένου.

A 80

Menstruation and the moon

SORANUS, GYNAECOLOGY

For sometimes it comes some days early, or falls behind. This happens in each woman at her own appointed term, and not always at the same intervals — as Diocles says it does in all women, and Empedocles again, when the light of the moon is waning. For some are purged before the twentieth and some on the twentieth; and again, some while the moon's light is waxing and some while it is waning.

Report preserved inside its own refutation.

Soranus is correcting Empedocles here, not reporting him, and the correction is the modern position: the cycle is individual and is not governed by the moon. The notice therefore preserves the doctrine in the act of being refuted, which is how a good deal of early physiology survives.

15–16 the supplements {κ ἄει} and {περιόδους} are Kalbfleisch's.

A 81

ARISTOTLE, ON THE GENERATION OF ANIMALS

οἱ δ' ἐν τῇ μήτραι, καθάπερ Ἐ· τὰ μὲν γὰρ εἰς θερμὴν ἐλθόντα τὴν ὑστέραν ἄρρενα γίνεσθαι φησι, τὰ δ' εἰς ψυχρὰν θήλεα, τῆς δὲ θερμότητος καὶ τῆς ψυχρότητος τὴν τῶν καταμηνίων αἰτίαν εἶναι ῥύσιν ἢ ψυχροτέραν οὔσαν ἢ θερμότεραν καὶ ἢ παλαιότεραν ἢ προσφατωτέραν ... τοῦτο γὰρ ὡς ἀληθῶς Ἐ· ῥαιθυμότερον ὑπείληφεν οἰόμενος ψυχρότητι καὶ θερμότητι διαφέρειν μόνον ἀλλήλων, ὁρῶν ὅλα τὰ μόρια μεγάλην ἔχοντα διαφορὰν τὴν τε τῶν αἰδοίων καὶ τὴν τῆς ὑστέρας.

ARISTOTLE, ON THE GENERATION OF ANIMALS

ἀναγκαῖον ἀπαντᾶν καὶ πρὸς τὸν Ἐμπεδοκλέους λόγον, ὃς διορίζει τὸ θῆλυ πρὸς τὸ ἄρρεν θερμότητι καὶ ψυχρότητι τῆς ὑστέρας.

AËTIUS

Ἐ· ἄρρενα καὶ θήλεα γίνεσθαι παρὰ θερμότητα καὶ ψυχρότητα· ὅθεν ἱστορεῖται τοὺς μὲν πρῶτους ἄρρενας πρὸς ἀνατολῇ καὶ μεσημβρίαν γεγενῆσθαι μᾶλλον ἐκ τῆς γῆς, τὰς δὲ θηλείας πρὸς ταῖς ἄρκτοις.

AËTIUS

Ἐ· τέρατα γίνεσθαι παρὰ πλεονασμὸν σπέρματος ἢ παρ' ἔλλειψιν ἢ παρὰ τὴν τῆς κινήσεως ταραχὴν ἢ παρὰ τὴν εἰς πλείω διαίρεσιν ἢ παρὰ τὸ ἀπονέειν. οὕτω προειληφῶς φαίνεται σχεδόν τι πάσας τὰς αἰτιολογίας.

AËTIUS

Ἐ· δίδυμα καὶ τρίδυμα γίνεσθαι κατὰ πλεονασμὸν καὶ περισχισμὸν τοῦ σπέρματος.

AËTIUS

πόθεν γίνονται τῶν γονέων αἱ ὁμοιώσεις καὶ τῶν προγόνων· Ἐ· ὁμοιότητος γίνεσθαι κατ' ἐπικράτειαν τῶν σπερματικῶν γόνων, ἀνομοιότητος δὲ τῆς ἐν τῷ σπέρματι θερμασίας ἐξατμισθείσης.

A 81

The generation of male and female, monsters, twins, and likeness

ARISTOTLE, ON THE GENERATION OF ANIMALS

Others place it in the womb, as Empedocles does. He says that what enters a hot womb becomes male, what enters a cold one female; and that the cause of the heat or the coldness is the flow of the menses, which is either colder or hotter, and either older or fresher ... For in truth Empedocles has taken this too carelessly, supposing that the sexes differ from one another by cold and heat alone, when he can see that whole parts differ greatly — the genitals and the womb.

ARISTOTLE, ON THE GENERATION OF ANIMALS

It is necessary to meet Empedocles' account as well, which distinguishes female from male by the heat and the coldness of the womb.

AËTIUS

Empedocles: male and female come about through heat and coldness; whence it is recorded that the first males were generated out of the earth rather toward the east and the south, and the females toward the north.

AËTIUS

Empedocles: monstrous births come about through excess of seed, or through deficiency, or through a disturbance of the motion, or through division into too many parts, or through a turning aside. So he appears to have anticipated very nearly all the accounts of the causes.

AËTIUS

Empedocles: twins and triplets come about through excess and splitting of the seed.

AËTIUS

Whence come likenesses to the parents and to ancestors? Empedocles: likenesses come about by the predominance of the generative seeds, and unlikenesses when the heat in the seed has been evaporated away.

A 81 (continued)

AËTIUS

πῶς ἄλλοις γίνονται ὅμοιοι οἱ γεννώμενοι καὶ οὐ τοῖς γονεῦσιν· Ἐ.
τῇ κατὰ τὴν σύλληψιν φαντασίαι τῆς γυναικὸς μορφοῦσθαι τὰ
βρέφη· πολλάκις γὰρ ἀνδριάντων καὶ εἰκόνων ἠράσθησαν γυναῖκες
καὶ ὅμοια τούτοις ἀπέτεκον.

CENSORINUS, ON THE BIRTHDAY

ex dextris partibus profuso semine mares gigni, at e laevis feminas
Anaxagoras Empedoclesque consentiunt. quorum opiniones, ut de hac
specie congruae, ita de similitudine liberorum dispariles; super qua re
Empedoclis, disputata ratione, talis profertur. si par calor in parentum
seminibus fuit, patri similem marem procreari; si frigus, feminam
matri similem. quodsi patris calidius erit et frigidius matris, puerum
fore qui matris vultus repraesentet: at si calidius matris, patris autem
fuerit frigidius, puellam futuram quae patris reddat similitudinem.

A 81 (continued)

AËTIUS

How do children come to resemble others and not their own parents? Empedocles: infants are shaped by the woman's imagination at the moment of conception. For women have often fallen in love with statues and with painted figures, and have borne children resembling them.

CENSORINUS, ON THE BIRTHDAY

Anaxagoras and Empedocles agree that when the seed is poured out from the right-hand parts males are begotten, and from the left-hand parts females. Their opinions, though they agree on that point, differ on the likeness of children; and on that matter Empedocles' view, when the reasoning is set out, is put thus. If the heat in the parents' seeds was equal, a male is begotten resembling the father; if the cold was equal, a female resembling the mother. But if the father's is the hotter and the mother's the colder, the child will be a boy who shows the mother's features; while if the mother's is the hotter and the father's the colder, it will be a girl who gives back the father's likeness.

A 81 (continued)

CENSORINUS, ON THE BIRTHDAY

sequitur de geminis, qui ut aliquando nascantur modo seminis fieri Hippon ratus <est>: id enim cum amplius est quam uni satis fuit, bifariam deduci. id ipsum ferme E. videtur sensisse: nam causas quidem cur divideretur non posuit; partiri tantum modo ait et si utrumque sedes aequae calidas occupaverit, utrumque marem nasci, si frigidas aequae, utramque feminam, si vero alterum calidiorem, alterum frigidiorum, dispari sexu partum futurum.

A 81 (continued)

CENSORINUS, ON THE BIRTHDAY

Next, concerning twins. Hippon held that they are sometimes born by reason of the quantity of the seed: for when it is more than was enough for one, it is drawn off two ways. Empedocles seems to have thought almost the same; for he did not set down the causes why it should divide, but only says that it divides — and that if both portions take up places equally hot, both are born male; if equally cold, both female; but if one is hotter and the other colder, the birth will be of different sexes.

Report from nine notices of unequal worth.

Nine separate notices stand behind this one number, and they do not all deserve the same credit. Aristotle is arguing with a text in front of him and quotes a real doctrine, then reproaches Empedocles for holding it carelessly. The Aëtius notices are handbook summaries, and the fourth of them contains the doxographer's own verdict rather than Empedocles' words — that he anticipated nearly every later explanation of monstrous birth, which is a compliment paid to a list. The last notice, on the woman's imagination shaping the child, had an extraordinarily long life: it is still being repeated, with Empedocles' name attached, in the medical literature of the seventeenth century.

Bearing on Volume I. Sex determined by temperature, and the first men and women generated in different latitudes — the embryology and the zoogony are one doctrine.

32 *ταραχήν* G: *ἀρχήν* in (A)BC. — 34 *αἰτιολογίας* Reiske: *ἀπολογίας* in (A)BC. Compare Hippocrates, *On Seed* 8; Soranus p. 204, 18 Rose; ps.-Galen XIV 253; Dionysius, *On Imitation* p. 17, 18 Usener. — Censorinus 3 Empedoclis Diels: *empedocles* in the manuscripts; *talia profatur* Lachmann. — 5 *frigus Carrio*: *frigidus* in the manuscripts. — 9 (*est*) *Carrio*. — Of the passage on twins Diels notes that it can hardly derive from Empedocles himself.

A 82

ARISTOTLE, ON THE GENERATION OF ANIMALS

τὸ δὲ τῶν ἡμιόνων γένος ὅλον ἄγονόν ἐστιν. περὶ δὲ τῆς αἰτίας, ὥς μὲν λέγουσιν Ἐ. καὶ Δημόκριτος, λέγων ὁ μὲν οὐ σαφῶς, Δημόκριτος δὲ γνωρίμως μᾶλλον, οὐ καλῶς εἰρήκασιν. λέγουσι γὰρ ἐπὶ πάντων ὁμοίως τὴν ἀπόδειξιν τῶν παρὰ τὴν συγγένειαν συνδυαζομένων ... Ἐ. δ' αἰτιάται κτλ.

AËTIUS

διὰ τί αἱ ἡμίονοι στεῖραι; Ἐ. διὰ τὴν σμικρότητα καὶ ταπεινότητα καὶ στενότητα τῆς μήτρας κατεστραμμένως προσπεφυκυίας τῇ γαστρὶ μήτε τοῦ σπέρματος εὐθυβολοῦντος εἰς αὐτὴν μήτε, εἰ καὶ φθάσειεν, αὐτῆς ἐκδεχομένης.

A 82

Why mules are barren

ARISTOTLE, ON THE GENERATION OF ANIMALS

The whole kind of mules is infertile. As to the cause: what Empedocles and Democritus say — the one speaking unclearly, Democritus rather more intelligibly — is not well said. For they offer one and the same demonstration for every case of animals that mate outside their own kind ... Empedocles assigns as the cause, and so on.

AËTIUS

Why are mules barren? Empedocles: because of the smallness and the lowness and the narrowness of the womb, which is attached to the belly the wrong way about, so that the seed neither strikes straight into it nor, even if it should get there, is received by it.

Report, with Aristotle's objection attached.

Aristotle's complaint is worth more than the doctrine: Empedocles and Democritus, he says, give one explanation for every cross-kind mating, and he rejects it for that reason. Empedocles' own account, as fragment B 92 shows, was that two soft things can mix into something hard — bronze from tin and copper — and the mule's seed was hardened in the same way. The Aëtius entry has lost that and put a purely anatomical explanation in its place.

Compare fragment B 92, where Aristotle quotes Empedocles' own comparison of the mixture to tin and copper.

A 83

AETIUS

Ἐ. ἐπὶ μὲν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἄρχεσθαι τῆς διαρθρώσεως ἀπὸ ἑκτῆς καὶ τριακοστῆς, τελειοῦσθαι δὲ τοῖς μορίοις ἀπὸ πεντηκοστῆς μιᾶς δεούσης.

ORIBASIIUS, FROM ATHENAEUS

περὶ δὲ τὰς τέσσαρας ἐννεάδας ὁράται πρῶτον διακεκριμένον ὅλον τὸ σῶμα ἢ τὸ τελευταῖον μιᾶς προστεθείσης τετράδος περὶ τὴν τεσσαρακοντάδα. συμφωνεῖ δὲ τοῖς χρόνοις τῆς παντελοῦς τῶν ἐμβρύων διακρίσεως καὶ ὁ φυσικὸς Ἐ. καὶ φησιν, ὅτι θᾶσσον διαμορφοῦται τὸ ἄρρεν τοῦ θήλεος καὶ τὰ ἐν τοῖς δεξιοῖς τῶν ἐν τοῖς εὐωνύμοις.

CENSORINUS, ON THE BIRTHDAY

septimo mense parere mulierem posse plurimi adfirmant ut ... Empedocles, Epigenes multique praeterea.

A 83

How long the embryo takes to form

AËTIUS

Empedocles: in the case of men, the articulation begins from the thirty-sixth day, and they are completed in their parts from the forty-ninth.

ORIBASIIUS, FROM ATHENAEUS

About the fourth period of nine days the whole body is first seen articulated, or at the latest, with one period of four days added, about the fortieth. Empedocles the natural philosopher agrees about the times of the embryo's complete differentiation, and says that the male is shaped sooner than the female, and the parts on the right sooner than those on the left.

CENSORINUS, ON THE BIRTHDAY

Very many affirm that a woman can give birth in the seventh month — among them Empedocles, Epigenes, and a good many besides.

Report, still cited as current by a physician seven centuries later.

The numbers are multiples of seven, and that is not accidental: thirty-six is not, but forty-nine is seven sevens, and the whole of Greek embryology counts in weeks. What is striking in the Oribasius notice is that a working physician of the fourth century after Christ cites Empedocles not as an authority from the past but as agreeing with the present state of the art.

Bearing on Volume I. Connects with A 75, the doctrine of the seven-month child.

24 ἀπό] Usener conjectures ἐπί.

A 84

CENSORINUS, ON THE BIRTHDAY

E., quem in hoc Aristoteles secutus est, ante omnia cor iudicavit
increscere, quod hominis vitam maxime contineat.

A 85

AËTIUS

Ἐ. τὸν μὲν ὕπνον καταψύξει τοῦ ἐν τῷ αἵματι θερμοῦ συμμέτρῳ
γίνεσθαι, τῇ δὲ παντελεῖ θάνατον.

AËTIUS

Ἐ. τὸν θάνατον γίνεσθαι διαχωρισμῶι τοῦ πυρώδους (καὶ ἀερώδους
καὶ ὕδατώδους καὶ γεώδους), ἐξ ὧν ἡ σύγκρισις τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ
συνεστάθη· ὥστε κατὰ τοῦτο κοινὸν εἶναι τὸν θάνατον σώματος καὶ
ψυχῆς· ὕπνον δὲ γίνεσθαι διαχωρισμῶι τοῦ πυρώδους.

A 84

The heart forms first

CENSORINUS, ON THE BIRTHDAY

Empedocles — whom Aristotle followed in this — judged that the heart grows before all else, on the ground that it more than anything holds a man's life together.

Report: a rare case of Aristotle following him.

One sentence, and it records a rare thing: Aristotle following Empedocles rather than correcting him. The reason given is not anatomical but functional, and it is the reason the heart will keep its primacy in physiology for the next two thousand years.

A 85

Sleep and death

AËTIUS

Empedocles: sleep comes about by a moderate cooling of the heat in the blood, and death by a complete one.

AËTIUS

Empedocles: death comes about by the separating off of the fiery (and the airy and the watery and the earthy), out of which the compound was put together for a man; so that in this respect death is common to body and soul alike. Sleep comes about by the separating off of the fiery alone.

Doxographic report, two notices, the second drawing a consequence.

Sleep and death differ by degree, not in kind: both are the withdrawal of fire from the blood, and sleep is the lesser withdrawal. The second notice draws the consequence that mattered most to later readers — that on this physics death is common to body and soul, since the soul is the ratio of a mixture and the mixture comes apart. Whether Empedocles himself held that, given what the Purifications say about the wandering daimon, is the oldest unsettled question about him.

Bearing on Volume I. The point at which the physics of Volume I and the religion of the Purifications appear to contradict each other.

34 καταψύξει B: κατὰ ψύξιν ACG. — 35 τῇ δὲ παντελεῖ Bernadakis, the manuscripts varying. — 36 the words in angle brackets supplied by Diels. — 38 διαχωρισμῶι Bernadakis: διαχωρισμόν in the manuscripts.

PERCEPTION AND THOUGHT

Theophrastus on the Senses; Pores, Effluences and the Soul

Diels-Kranz 31 A 86 – A 98

A single Diels number and a whole chapter: Theophrastus, Aristotle's successor at the Lyceum, on how Empedocles thought seeing, hearing, smelling and thinking work. Sections 3 to 6, which treat Parmenides, Plato and Alcmaeon, are not part of the number and are not printed.

It falls into two halves. Sections 7 to 11 set out the doctrine — the eye as a lantern with fire inside it and a screen of finer stuff around it, the ear as a bell, and thought as a property of blood, so that a man is slow or quick or eloquent according to how the elements lie in the blood of one particular limb.

From section 12 Theophrastus takes the account apart, and the refutation is the more informative half, because to refute a position he must first state it exactly. Several things we know about Empedocles survive only because they were worth objecting to.

After it come the twelve numbers that close the A-testimonia. They are the machinery the chapter argues about, stated in its own terms: the passages and solid parts of A 87, the mirror, the lodestone of A 89 — the earliest theory of magnetism there is, and the earliest four objections to one — colour as an effluence commensurate with sight, the bell in the ear, appetite as a physical deficit, and the identity of mind with soul, which is what makes the transmigration of the Purifications a physical doctrine rather than a pious hope.

A 86 §§ 1-2

ON THE SENSES 1

Παρμενίδης μὲν καὶ Ἐ. καὶ Πλάτων τῷ ὁμοίῳ, οἱ δὲ περὶ
Ἀναξαγόραν καὶ Ἡράκλειτον τῷ ἐναντίῳ ...

ON THE SENSES 2

περὶ ἐκάστης δὲ τῶν κατὰ μέρος οἱ μὲν ἄλλοι σχεδὸν ἀπολείπουσιν,
Ἐ. δὲ πειρᾶται καὶ ταύτας ἀνάγειν εἰς τὴν ὁμοιότητα.

A 86 §§ 1-2

Theophrastus places Empedocles among those who explain perception by likeness

ON THE SENSES 1

Parmenides and Empedocles and Plato [account for perception] by the like; the school of Anaxagoras and Heraclitus by the opposite ...

ON THE SENSES 2

About each of the senses taken singly the others give up almost entirely; Empedocles tries to bring these too under likeness.

The opening of the longest continuous testimony in the collection.

Theophrastus succeeded Aristotle as head of the Lyceum, and On the Senses is the first history of a philosophical problem ever written. What follows is not a doxographic notice but a sustained reading of Empedocles' own text by a man who had it in front of him, and it is the single most valuable document about him after the fragments themselves. Its second half is a refutation, and that is precisely why it is so informative: to refute a doctrine Theophrastus must first state it exactly.

Bearing on Volume I. Everything in this chapter bears on B 84, B 89, B 100, B 105 and B 107, and is the frame in which those fragments were read in antiquity.

Sections 3 to 6 treat Parmenides, Plato and Alcmaeon, and are omitted here.

A 86 §§ 7-8

ON THE SENSES 7

Ἐ. δὲ περὶ ἀπασῶν ὁμοίως λέγει καὶ φησι τῷ ἐναρμόττειν εἰς τοὺς πόρους τοὺς ἐκάστης αἰσθάνεσθαι· διὸ καὶ οὐ δύνασθαι τὰ ἀλλήλων κρίνειν, ὅτι τῶν μὲν εὐρύτεροί πως, τῶν δὲ στενώτεροι τυγχάνουσιν οἱ πόροι πρὸς τὸ αἰσθητόν, ὥς τὰ μὲν οὐχ ἀπτόμενα διευτονεῖν τὰ δ' ὅλως εἰσελθεῖν οὐ δύνασθαι. πειράται δὲ καὶ τὴν ὄψιν λέγειν, ποία τίς ἐστι· καὶ φησι τὸ μὲν ἐντὸς αὐτῆς εἶναι πῦρ, τὸ δὲ περὶ αὐτὸ 〈ὔδωρ καὶ〉 γῆν καὶ ἀέρα δι' ὧν διέναι λεπτὸν ὃν καθάπερ τὸ ἐν τοῖς λαμπτήρσι φῶς. τοὺς δὲ πόρους ἐναλλάξ κεῖσθαι τοῦ τε πυρὸς καὶ τοῦ ὕδατος, ὧν τοῖς μὲν τοῦ πυρὸς τὰ λευκά, τοῖς δὲ τοῦ ὕδατος τὰ μέλανα γνωρίζειν· ἐναρμόττειν γὰρ ἐκατέροις ἐκότερα. φέρεσθαι δὲ τὰ χρώματα πρὸς τὴν ὄψιν διὰ τὴν ἀπορροήν.

A 86 §§ 7-8

Sight: fire within, the alternating passages, and why some creatures see better at night

ON THE SENSES 7

Empedocles speaks in the same way about all the senses, and says that perceiving comes about by things fitting into the passages of each sense. This is why the senses cannot judge one another's objects: the passages are in some cases too wide and in others too narrow for the perceptible thing, so that some things run straight through without touching and others cannot get in at all. He tries also to say what sort of thing the sight is. He says that the inside of it is fire, and around that (water and) earth and air, through which the fire, being fine, passes as the light does in lanterns. The passages of fire and of water lie alternately; by those of fire we recognise white things and by those of water black things, for each fits into each. And the colours are carried to the sight by effluence.

A 86 §§ 7-8 (continued)

ON THE SENSES 8

συγκεῖσθαι δ' οὐχ ὁμοίως, <ἀλλὰ τὰς μὲν ἐκ τῶν ὁμοίων>, τὰς δ' ἐκ τῶν ἀντικειμένων, καὶ ταῖς μὲν ἐν μέσῳ, ταῖς δ' ἐκτὸς εἶναι τὸ πῦρ· διὸ καὶ τῶν ζώων τὰ μὲν ἐν ἡμέραι, τὰ δὲ νύκτωρ μᾶλλον ὀξυωπεῖν· ὅσα μὲν πυρὸς ἔλαττον ἔχει, μεθ' ἡμέραν· ἐπανισοῦσθαι γὰρ αὐτοῖς τὸ ἐντὸς φῶς ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐκτός· ὅσα δὲ τοῦ ἐναντίου, νύκτωρ· ἐπαναπληροῦσθαι γὰρ καὶ τούτοις τὸ ἐνδές· ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἐναντίοις <ἐναντίως> ἐκότερον. ἀμβλυωπεῖν μὲν γὰρ καὶ οἷς ὑπερέχει τὸ πῦρ· ἐπαυξηθὲν <γὰρ> ἔτι μεθ' ἡμέραν ἐπιπλάττειν καὶ καταλαμβάνειν τοὺς τοῦ ὕδατος πόρους· οἷς δὲ τὸ ὕδωρ, ταῦτό τοῦτο γίνεσθαι νύκτωρ· καταλαμβάνεσθαι γὰρ τὸ πῦρ ὑπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος. <γίνεσθαι δὲ ταῦτα>, ἕως ἂν τοῖς μὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἔξωθεν φωτός ἀποκριθῇ τὸ ὕδωρ, τοῖς δ' ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀέρος τὸ πῦρ. ἐκατέρων γὰρ ἴσιν εἶναι τὸ ἐναντίον. ἄριστα δὲ κεκρᾶσθαι καὶ βελτίστην εἶναι τὴν ἐξ ἀμφοῖν ἴσων συγκειμένην. καὶ περὶ μὲν ὧς σχεδὸν ταῦτα λέγει.

A 86 §§ 7-8 (continued)

ON THE SENSES 8

Eyes are not all put together alike: (some out of like elements) and others out of opposed ones, and in some the fire is at the centre, in others outside. This is why some animals see more keenly by day and others by night. Those that have less fire see by day, for their inner light is brought level by the light outside; those that have less of the opposite see by night, for in them too what is lacking is filled up. In the opposite cases each works (the opposite way). For those in whom the fire is in excess also see dimly: being further increased by day, it spreads over and takes possession of the passages of water; and in those in whom the water is in excess the same happens at night, the fire being taken over by the water. (And this goes on) until, for the one kind, the water is separated off by the light from outside, and for the other the fire is separated off by the air. For the cure of each is its opposite. The best-blended and best eye is the one composed of the two in equal parts. That is very nearly all he says about sight.

Exposition, before the criticism begins.

The lantern is Empedocles' own image and it survives in verse at B 84 — the eye as a lamp carried out into the night, with the fire inside and a screen of finer stuff around it. What Theophrastus adds is the machinery: two sorts of passage lying alternately, fire beside water, so that white and black are perceived by different apertures of the same organ. The account of night vision follows strictly from the compensation principle already seen at A 73: an eye sees best when the outside supplies what the inside lacks.

Bearing on Volume I. The prose behind B 84, and the fullest ancient statement of the theory of pores.

7 πως Diels: πρὸς in the manuscripts. — 10 {ῥῶδω και} supplied by Diels. — 15 and 20 the angle brackets are Diels's supplements; 21 {γὰρ} Schneider. — 24 by ἀέρος Diels understands air including water. — 26 συγκεκμηένην Stephanus: συγκεκμηένων in the manuscripts.

A 86 § 9

ON THE SENSES 9

τὴν δ' ἀκοὴν ἀπὸ τῶν ἔσωθεν γίνεσθαι ψόφων, ὅταν ὁ ἀὴρ ὑπὸ τῆς φωνῆς κινηθεὶς ἤχῃ ἐντός. ὥσπερ γὰρ εἶναι κώδωνα τῶν ἴσων ἤχων τὴν ἀκοήν, ἣν προσαγορεύει σάρκινον ὄζον· κινουμένην δὲ παίειν τὸν ἀέρα πρὸς τὰ στερεὰ καὶ ποιεῖν ἤχον. ὁσφρησιν δὲ γίνεσθαι τῇ ἀναπνοῇ. διὸ καὶ μάλιστα ὁσφραίνεσθαι τούτους, οἷς σφοδροτάτη τοῦ ἄσθματος ἡ κίνησις· ὁσμὴν δὲ πλείστην ἀπὸ τῶν λεπτῶν καὶ τῶν κούφων ἀπορρεῖν. περὶ δὲ γεύσεως καὶ ἀφῆς οὐ διορίζεται καθ' ἑκατέραν οὔτε πῶς οὔτε δι' ἃ γίνονται, πλὴν τὸ κοινὸν ὅτι τῷ ἐναρμόττειν τοῖς πόροις αἰσθησίς ἐστιν· ἥδεσθαι δὲ τοῖς ὁμοίοις κατὰ τε <τὰ> μόρια καὶ τὴν κρᾶσιν, λυπεῖσθαι δὲ τοῖς ἐναντίοις.

A 86 § 9

Hearing, smell, taste and touch

ON THE SENSES 9

Hearing comes about from sounds inside, when the air, set moving by the voice, rings within. For the ear is a kind of bell for the sounds that come in, and he calls it a "sprout of flesh"; and when it is set moving it beats the air against the solid parts and makes a ringing. Smell comes about by breathing. Hence those smell most keenly in whom the movement of the breath is most violent; and the most odour flows off from fine and light bodies. About taste and touch he lays down nothing separately — neither how they come about nor through what — beyond the common point that perception is by fitting into the passages; and that we take pleasure in what is like us, both in respect of the parts and of the blend, and are pained by what is opposite.

Exposition, and the shortest part of the chapter.

"A sprout of flesh" is Empedocles' phrase for the ear, preserved at B 99, and the bell is Theophrastus' gloss on it. Note what happens to taste and touch: Empedocles gave them no separate mechanism, and Theophrastus says so plainly rather than supplying one. It is a good illustration of what this witness is worth — he records a gap where a doxographer would have filled it.

Bearing on Volume I. The context for B 99, and the point Theophrastus will press hard at § 20.

27 ἔσωθεν Karsten, from p. 220, 7: ἔξωθεν in the manuscripts. — 28 ὁ ἄηρ Diels: γάρ in the manuscripts. — κώδων here is a bell, not a trumpet, as at Philoponus, *On the Soul* 355, 17. — ἴσων is unintelligible; Diels conjectures εἰσιόντων, Schneider ἔσω. — 29 for σάρκινον ὄζον Diels suspects σάρκινον ὄγκον. — 34 (τὰ) supplied by Diels.

A 86 §§ 10-11

ON THE SENSES 10

ώσαύτως δὲ λέγει καὶ περὶ φρονήσεως καὶ ἀγνοίας. τὸ μὲν γὰρ φρονεῖν εἶναι τοῖς ὁμοίοις, τὸ δ' ἀγνοεῖν τοῖς ἀνομοίοις, ὥς ἢ ταὐτὸν ἢ παραπλήσιον ὄν τῇ αἰσθήσει τὴν φρόνησιν. διαριθμησάμενος γάρ, ὥς ἕκαστον ἐκάστωι γνωρίζομεν, ἐπὶ τέλει προσέθηκεν ὥς ἐκ τούτων ... ἀνιῶνται. διὸ καὶ τῷ αἵματι μάλιστα φρονεῖν· ἐν τούτῳ γὰρ μάλιστα κεκρᾶσθαι τὰ στοιχεῖα τῶν μερῶν.

ON THE SENSES 11

ὅσοις μὲν οὖν ἴσα καὶ παραπλήσια μέμικται καὶ μὴ διὰ πολλοῦ μὴδ' αὖ μικρὰ μὴδ' ὑπερβάλλοντα τῷ μεγέθει, τούτους φρονιμωτάτους εἶναι καὶ κατὰ τὰς αἰσθήσεις ἀκριβεστάτους, κατὰ λόγον δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἐγγυτάτω τούτων, ὅσοις δ' ἐναντίως, ἀφρονεστάτους. καὶ ὧν μὲν μανὰ καὶ ἀραιὰ κεῖται τὰ στοιχεῖα, νωθροὺς καὶ ἐπιπόνους· ὧν δὲ πυκνὰ καὶ κατὰ μικρὰ τεθραυσμένα, τοὺς δὲ τοιούτους ὀξεῖς φερομένους καὶ πολλοῖς ἐπιβαλλομένους ὀλίγα ἐπιτελεῖν διὰ τὴν ὀξύτητα τῆς τοῦ αἵματος φορᾶς· οἷς δὲ καθ' ἓν τι μόριον ἢ μέση κρᾶσις ἐστι, ταύτῃ σοφοὺς ἐκάστους εἶναι· διὸ τοὺς μὲν ῥήτορας ἀγαθοὺς, τοὺς δὲ τεχνίτας, ὥς τοῖς μὲν ἐν ταῖς χερσί, τοῖς δὲ ἐν τῇ γλώττῃ τὴν κρᾶσιν οὔσαν· ὁμοίως δ' ἔχειν καὶ κατὰ τὰς ἄλλας δυνάμεις.

A 86 §§ 10–11

Thought is in the blood, and character follows the blend

ON THE SENSES 10

He speaks in the same way about thought and ignorance. Thinking is by the like, ignorance by the unlike, thought being either the same as perception or very close to it. For having reckoned up how by each thing we know each, he added at the end that out of these all things are fitted together and joined. This is why we think above all with the blood: for in the blood, above all, the elements of the parts are blended.

ON THE SENSES 11

Those in whom the elements are mixed in equal and nearly equal measure, and neither too widely spaced nor too small nor excessive in size, are the most intelligent and the most exact in their perceptions; and in proportion, those who come nearest to them; while those in the contrary condition are the most senseless. Those in whom the elements lie loose and rare are sluggish and laborious; those in whom they are dense and broken up small are quick-moving, and, setting their hand to many things, finish few, because of the swiftness with which their blood travels. Those who have the balanced blend in some one part are wise in that part: hence some are good speakers and others good craftsmen, the blend being in the hands of the one and in the tongue of the other. And it is the same with the other faculties.

Exposition, with a verse quotation embedded.

This is the passage that makes Empedocles' psychology a physiology. Thought is not a faculty but a state of a fluid, and a man's character is the geometry of his own blood: loose particles make him slow, small hard ones make him quick and unfinished, and a good blend in the tongue makes him an orator. It is the oldest surviving temperament theory in Europe, and the ancestor of everything the humoral tradition would build for the next two millennia.

Bearing on Volume I. The prose behind B 105, "the blood around the heart is men's thought."

5 ἐστὶ deleted by Mullach. — 12 πολλοῖς Wimmer: πολλά in the manuscripts. The quotation at the end of § 10 is fragment B 107.

A 86 §§ 12-13

ON THE SENSES 12

Ἐ. μὲν οὖν οὕτως οἶεται καὶ τὴν αἴσθησιν γίνεσθαι καὶ τὸ φρονεῖν, ἀπορήσειε δ' ἂν τις ἐξ ὧν λέγει πρῶτον μὲν, τί διοίσει τὰ ἔμψυχα πρὸς τὸ αἰσθάνεσθαι τῶν ἀψύχων· ἐναρμόττει γὰρ καὶ τοῖς τῶν ἀψύχων πόρος· ὅλως γὰρ ποιεῖ τὴν μίξιν τῇ συμμετρίας τῶν πόρων· διόπερ ἔλαιον μὲν καὶ ὕδωρ οὐ μείγνυσθαι, τὰ δὲ ἄλλα ὑγρὰ καὶ περὶ ὅσων δὴ καταριθμεῖται τὰς ἰδίας κράσεις. ὥστε πάντα τε αἰσθήσεται καὶ ταὐτὸν ἔσται μίξις καὶ αἴσθησις καὶ αὔξησις· πάντα γὰρ ποιεῖ τῇ συμμετρίας τῶν πόρων, ἐὰν μὴ προσθῇ τινα διαφοράν.

ON THE SENSES 13

ἔπειτα ἐν αὐτοῖς τοῖς ἔμψυχοις τί μᾶλλον αἰσθήσεται τὸ ἐν τῷ ζῳίῳ πυρὴ ἢ τὸ ἐκτός, εἴπερ ἐναρμόττουσιν ἀλλήλοις; ὑπάρχει γὰρ καὶ ἡ συμμετρία καὶ τὸ ὅμοιον. ἔτι δὲ ἀνάγκη διαφοράν τινα ἔχειν, εἴπερ αὐτὸ μὲν μὴ δύναται συμπληροῦν τοὺς πόρους, τὸ δ' ἔξωθεν ἐπεισιόν· ὥστ' εἰ ὅμοιον ἦν πάντῃ καὶ πάντως, οὐκ ἂν ἦν αἴσθησις. ἔτι δὲ πότερον οἱ πόροι κενοὶ ἢ πλήρεις; εἰ μὲν γὰρ κενοί, συμβαίνει διαφωνεῖν ἑαυτῶν· φησὶ γὰρ ὅλως οὐκ εἶναι κενόν· εἰ δὲ πλήρεις, ἀεὶ ἂν αἰσθάνοιτο τὰ ζῳα· δῆλον γὰρ ὡς ἐναρμόττει, καθάπερ φησί, τὸ ὅμοιον.

A 86 §§ 12-13

The first objections: what separates the living from the lifeless, and is there void?

ON THE SENSES 12

This, then, is how Empedocles thinks perception and thinking come about. But one might raise difficulties from his own words. First: what will distinguish living things from lifeless ones, so far as perceiving goes? For a passage fits in lifeless things too, since he makes mixture as such depend on the commensurability of the passages — which is why oil and water do not mix, whereas the other liquids do, and all the cases whose particular blends he enumerates. It will follow that everything perceives, and that mixture and perception and growth are one and the same; for he produces everything by the commensurability of the passages, unless he adds some further difference.

ON THE SENSES 13

Next, within living things themselves: why will the fire inside the animal perceive any more than the fire outside, if they fit one another? For both the commensurability and the likeness are there. Besides, there must be some difference, if the inner fire cannot fill the passages by itself but something must come in from outside — so that if it were alike in every way and altogether, there would be no perception at all. Again: are the passages empty or full? If empty, he contradicts himself, for he says there is no void whatever; if full, animals would always be perceiving, since, as he says, the like plainly fits.

The refutation begins.

Two objections, and the second is the sharper. Empedocles denies the void outright, yet his whole theory requires passages for things to travel through; Theophrastus sees that the passages must be either empty, which contradicts the denial, or full, in which case perception never stops. It is the first recorded instance of a physical theory being caught between two of its own commitments, and the difficulty it raises would not be resolved until the atomists accepted the void that Empedocles refused.

Bearing on Volume I. Bears directly on B 13 and B 14, where the denial of void is stated in verse. 18 πρὸς τῷ in the manuscripts: corrected by Schneider. — 34 καὶ συμβαίνει in the manuscripts: corrected by Schneider.

A 86 §§ 14-15

ON THE SENSES 14

καίτοι κἂν αὐτὸ τοῦτό τις διαπορήσειεν, εἰ δυνατόν ἐστι τηλικαῦτα μεγέθη γενέσθαι τῶν ἑτερογενῶν, ὥστ' ἐναρμόττειν, ἄλλως τε κἂν συμβαίνειν, καθάπερ φησί, τὰς ὄψεις ὧν ἀσύμμετρος ἡ κρᾶσις ὅτε μὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ πυρός, ὅτε δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀέρος ἐμπλαττομένων τῶν πόρων ἀμαυροῦσθαι. εἰ δ' οὖν ἐστι καὶ τούτων συμμετρία καὶ πλήρεις οἱ πόροι τῶν μὴ συγγενῶν, πῶς, ὅταν αἰσθάνηται, καὶ ποῦ ταῦτα ὑπεξέρχεται; δεῖ γάρ τινα ἀποδοῦναι μεταβολήν. ὥστε πάντως ἔχει δυσκολίαν· ἢ γὰρ κενὸν ἀνάγκη ποιεῖν, ἢ αἰεὶ τὰ ζῶια αἰσθάνεσθαι πάντων, ἢ τὸ μὴ συγγενὲς ἀρμόττειν οὐ ποιοῦν αἴσθησιν οὐδ' ἔχον μεταβολὴν οἰκείαν τοῖς ἐμποιοῦσιν.

ON THE SENSES 15

ἔτι δέ, εἰ καὶ μὴ ἐναρμόττοι τὸ ὅμοιον, ἀλλὰ μόνον ἄπτοιο, καθ' ὅτι οὖν εὐλογον αἴσθησιν γίνεσθαι· δυοῖν γὰρ τούτοις ἀποδίδωσι τὴν γνῶσιν τῷ τε ὁμοίῳ καὶ τῇ ἀφῇ· διὸ καὶ τὸ ἀρμόττειν εἴρηκεν. ὥστ' εἰ τὸ ἕλαττον ἄψαιτο τῶν μειζόνων, εἴη ἂν αἴσθησις. ὅλως τε κατὰ γε ἐκεῖνον ἀφαιρεῖται καὶ τὸ ὅμοιον, ἀλλὰ ἡ συμμετρία μόνον ἱκανόν. διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ οὐκ αἰσθάνεσθαί φησιν ἀλλήλων, ὅτι τοὺς πόρους ἀσύμμετρος ἔχουσιν· εἰ δ' ὅμοιον ἢ ἀνόμοιον τὸ ἀπορρέον, οὐδὲν ἔτι προσαφώρισεν.

A 86 §§ 14–15

Fitting, touching, and whether likeness is doing any work at all

ON THE SENSES 14

And one might raise this very difficulty: whether magnitudes of different kinds can come to be of such a size as to fit at all — the more so if, as he says, eyes whose blend is out of proportion are dimmed, now by fire and now by air, because their passages get stopped up. If, then, there is a commensurability in these cases too, and the passages are full of things not akin to them, how does the eye perceive when it does perceive, and where do those things withdraw to? For some change must be accounted for. So the difficulty is unavoidable: either one must posit a void, or animals must always be perceiving everything, or what is not akin must fit — while producing no perception and undergoing no change proper to the things that fill it.

ON THE SENSES 15

Further: even if the like did not fit but only touched, in whatever manner, it would be reasonable that perception should occur. For he assigns knowledge to two things, likeness and contact — which is why he speaks of fitting. So that if the smaller touched the larger, there would be perception. And on his view likeness is really done away with altogether, and commensurability alone suffices. For he says that things do not perceive one another for just this reason, that their passages are out of proportion; but whether what flows off is like or unlike he laid down nothing further.

The refutation, continued.

The second of these is the deepest criticism in the chapter. Empedocles' explanation, Theophrastus notices, actually rests on two different principles at once — that like knows like, and that a thing fits a passage of the right size — and the second does all the work. If perception is a matter of proportion, likeness has become an idle wheel. That is a purely logical objection, and it is made without a single appeal to observation.

Bearing on Volume I. Bears on B 109, "by earth we see earth" — the doctrine Theophrastus is dismantling here.

35 φασί in the manuscripts: corrected by Schneider. — 37 μὴ Schneider: μέν in the manuscripts. — 42 ἐναρμόττει in the manuscripts: corrected by Stephanus.

A 86 §§ 16-17

ON THE SENSES 16

ἀλλὰ μὴν οὐδὲ τὴν ἡδονὴν καὶ λύπην ὁμολογουμένως ἀποδιδώσιν ἥδεσθαι μὲν ποιῶν τοῖς ὁμοίοις, λυπεῖσθαι δὲ τοῖς ἐναντίοις· ἐχθρὰ γὰρ εἶναι, διότι πλεῖστον ... ἐκμακτοῖσιν. αἰσθήσεις γὰρ τινὰς ἢ μετ' αἰσθήσεως ποιοῦσι τὴν ἡδονὴν καὶ τὴν λύπην, ὥστε οὐχ ἅπασι γίνεται τοῖς ὁμοίοις. ἔτι εἰ τὰ συγγενῇ μάλιστα ποιεῖ τὴν ἡδονὴν ἐν τῇ ἀφῇ, καθάπερ φησί, τὰ σύμφυτα μάλιστ' ἂν ἡδοίτο καὶ ὅλως αἰσθάνοιτο· διὰ τῶν αὐτῶν γὰρ ποιεῖ τὴν αἴσθησιν καὶ τὴν ἡδονήν.

ON THE SENSES 17

καίτοι πολλάκις αἰσθανόμενοι λυπούμεθα κατ' αὐτὴν τὴν αἴσθησιν, ὥς <δ> Ἀναξαγόρας φησὶν, αἰεὶ· πᾶσαν γὰρ αἴσθησιν εἶναι μετὰ λύπης. ἔτι δ' ἐν ταῖς κατὰ μέρος· συμβαίνει γὰρ τῷ ὁμοίῳ γίνεσθαι τὴν γνῶσιν· τὴν γὰρ ὄψιν ὅταν ἐκ πυρὸς καὶ τοῦ ἐναντίου συστήσῃ, τὸ μὲν λευκὸν καὶ τὸ μέλαν δύναιτ' ἂν τοῖς ὁμοίοις γνωρίζειν, τὸ δὲ φαιὸν καὶ τᾶλλα χρώματα τὰ μεικτὰ πῶς; οὔτε γὰρ τοῖς τοῦ πυρὸς οὔτε τοῖς τοῦ ὕδατος πόροις οὔτ' ἄλλοις ποιεῖ κοινοῖς ἐξ ἀμφοῖν· ὁρῶμεν δ' οὐδὲν ἦττον ταῦτα τῶν ἀπλῶν.

A 86 §§ 16-17

Pleasure and pain; and the colours that are neither white nor black

ON THE SENSES 16

Nor indeed does he give a consistent account of pleasure and pain, making pleasure come from likes and pain from opposites — "for they are hostile, because they are most ..." and "in things wrung apart." For pleasure and pain are made to be perceptions of a kind, or things accompanied by perception; so that they do not arise from likes in every case. Further: if it is akin things that most produce pleasure in touch, as he says, then things naturally grown together would take the greatest pleasure, and would perceive most of all; for he produces perception and pleasure by the very same means.

ON THE SENSES 17

And yet we are often pained in the very act of perceiving — indeed always, as Anaxagoras says, since all perception is accompanied by pain. Further, in the particular senses: knowledge is supposed to come about by the like. When he constitutes the sight out of fire and its opposite, it could recognise white and black by their likes — but grey, and the other mixed colours, how? For he assigns them neither to the passages of fire nor to those of water, nor to any others common to both. And we see these no less clearly than we see the simple colours.

The refutation, continued.

The objection about grey is a small masterpiece of criticism. Empedocles gave the eye two kinds of passage and two colours to match them, and Theophrastus simply points at everything in between. A theory built on matching like to like has no way to account for a mixture that matches nothing, and it is exactly what a reader who has the book open in front of him would notice.

Bearing on Volume I. Bears on A 69a and B 94, where white is assigned to fire and black to water.

6 {τ'} Usener. — 12 Kranz takes ἅπασαι with αἰσθήσεις. — 15 {δ'} Wimmer. — The two quoted phrases are from fragment B 22, 6-7.

A 86 §§ 18-19

ON THE SENSES 18

ἀτόπως δὲ καὶ ὅτι τὰ μὲν ἡμέρας, τὰ δὲ νύκτωρ μᾶλλον ὀρᾷ. τὸ γὰρ ἔλαττον πῦρ ὑπὸ τοῦ πλείονος φθείρεται, διὸ καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἥλιον καὶ ὅλως τὸ καθαρὸν οὐ δυνάμεθ' ἀντιβλέπειν. ὥστε ὅσοις ἐνδεέστερον τὸ φῶς, ἥττον ἐχρῆν ὀρᾶν μεθ' ἡμέραν· ἢ εἴπερ τὸ ὅμοιον συναύξει, καθάπερ φησί, τὸ δὲ ἐναντίον φθείρει καὶ κωλύει, τὰ μὲν λευκὰ μᾶλλον ἐχρῆν ὀρᾶν ἅπαντας μεθ' ἡμέραν καὶ ὅσοις ἔλαττον καὶ ὅσοις πλεῖον τὸ φῶς, τὰ δὲ μέλανα νύκτωρ. νῦν δὲ πάντες ἅπαντα μεθ' ἡμέραν μᾶλλον ὀρῶσι πλὴν ὀλίγων ζώων. τούτοις δ' εὖλογον τοῦτ' ἰσχύειν τὸ οἰκεῖον πῦρ, ὥσπερ ἕνια καὶ τῇ χροαὶ διαλάμπει μᾶλλον τῆς νυκτός.

ON THE SENSES 19

ἔτι δ' οἷς ἢ κρᾶσις ἐξ ἴσων, ἀνάγκη συναύξεσθαι κατὰ μέρος ἐκατέρους· ὥστ' εἰ πλεονάζον κωλύει θάτερον ὀρᾶν, ἀπάντων ἂν εἴη παραπλησία πῶς ἢ διάθεσις. ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν τῆς ὀψεως πάθη χαλεπώτερον ἔσται διελεῖν. τὰ δὲ περὶ τὰς ἄλλας αἰσθήσεις πῶς κρίνομεν τῷ ὁμοίῳ; τὸ γὰρ ὅμοιον ἀόριστον. οὔτε γὰρ ψόφῳ τὸν ψόφον οὔτ' ὁσμῇ τὴν ὁσμὴν οὔτε τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς ὁμογενέσιν, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον ὥς εἰπεῖν τοῖς ἐναντίοις. ἀπαθῇ γὰρ δεῖ τὴν αἴσθησιν προσάγειν· ἥχου δὲ ἐνόητος ἐν ὣσιν ἢ χυλῶν ἐν γεύσει καὶ ὁσμῆς ἐν ὁσφρήσει κωφότεραι πᾶσαι γίνονται (καὶ) μᾶλλον ὅσῳ ἂν πλήρεις ᾧσι τῶν ὁμοίων, εἰ μή τις λεχθείη περὶ τούτων διορισμός.

A 86 §§ 18-19

Day and night vision again; and how the other senses could judge by likeness

ON THE SENSES 18

It is absurd, too, that some creatures see better by day and others by night. For the lesser fire is destroyed by the greater — which is why we cannot look straight at the sun, or at pure fire at all. So those whose light is more deficient ought to see less by day; or else, if the like increases the like, as he says, while the opposite destroys and hinders it, then everyone ought to see white things better by day, those with less light and those with more alike, and black things better by night. In fact all creatures see everything better by day, apart from a few animals. In these it is reasonable that their own fire should prevail, just as some of them shine out in their very colour more by night.

ON THE SENSES 19

Further, in those whose blend is of equal parts, both must be increased alternately; so that if an excess of one hinders seeing, the condition of them all would be more or less the same. But the affections of sight will be the harder to settle. As for the other senses — how do we judge by the like? For the like is indefinite. We do not judge a sound by sound, or a smell by smell, or the rest by things of the same kind, but rather, one might say, by their opposites. For the sense must be brought to its object unaffected: when there is a ringing in the ears, or flavours in the tasting, or an odour in the nostrils, all the senses grow duller, and the duller the fuller they are of what is like — unless some distinction were drawn about these cases.

The refutation, continued.

Section 19 states the principle that will govern the theory of perception for the rest of antiquity: a sense-organ must be neutral with respect to what it perceives. An ear already full of sound cannot hear; a tongue already carrying a flavour cannot taste. Aristotle will make this a cornerstone. Empedocles' like-by-like doctrine says the reverse, and Theophrastus has found the place where the two collide.

22 ἀτόπως Diels, understood with λέγει. — 29 διαλάμπειν in the manuscripts: corrected by Stephanus. — 37 the supplement is Diels's.

A 86 §§ 20-21

ON THE SENSES 20

ἔτι δὲ τὸ περὶ τὴν ἀπορροήν, καίπερ οὐχ ἱκανῶς λεγόμενον περὶ μὲν τὰς ἄλλας ὅμως ἔστι πως ὑπολαβεῖν, περὶ δὲ τὴν ἀφήν καὶ γεῦσιν οὐ ράδιον. πῶς γὰρ τῇ ἀπορροῇ κρίνωμεν ἢ πῶς ἐναρμόττον τοῖς πόροις τὸ τραχὺ καὶ τὸ λεῖον; μόνου γὰρ δοκεῖ τῶν στοιχείων τοῦ πυρὸς ἀπορρεῖν, ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν ἄλλων οὐδενός. ἔτι δ' εἰ ἡ φθίσις διὰ τὴν ἀπορροήν, ὥπερ χρῆται κοινοτάτῳ σημείῳ, συμβαίνει δὲ καὶ τὰς ὀσμὰς ἀπορροῇ γίνεσθαι, τὰ πλείστην ἔχοντα ὀσμήν τάχιστ' ἐχρῆν φθειρέσθαι. νῦν δὲ σχεδὸν ἐναντίως ἔχει· τὰ γὰρ ὀσμωδέστατα τῶν φυτῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἐστὶ χρονιώτατα. συμβαίνει δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς Φιλίας ὅλως μὴ εἶναι αἴσθησιν ἢ ἥττον διὰ τὸ συγκρίνεσθαι τότε καὶ μὴ ἀπορρεῖν.

A 86 §§ 20–21

Effluence, and what it cannot explain

ON THE SENSES 20

Further, the doctrine of effluence, though it is not stated adequately, can somehow be understood for the other senses, but not easily for touch and taste. For how shall we judge the rough and the smooth by effluence, or by their fitting into the passages? Of the elements, fire alone seems to flow off, and none of the others. Again, if wasting away is caused by effluence — which he uses as his commonest proof — and if odours also come about by effluence, then the things with the most odour ought to perish the soonest. In fact very nearly the opposite holds: the most fragrant of plants and of other things are the longest-lived. And it follows also that under the reign of Love there should be no perception at all, or less of it, since at that time things are being drawn together and not flowing off.

A 86 §§ 20–21 (continued)

ON THE SENSES 21

ἀλλὰ περὶ μὲν τὴν ἀκοὴν ὅταν ἀποδῶι τοῖς ἔσωθεν γίνεσθαι ψόφοις, ἄτοπον τὸ οἶεσθαι δῆλον εἶναι πῶς ἀκούουσιν, ἔνδον ποιήσαντα ψόφον ὥσπερ κώδωνος. τῶν μὲν γὰρ ἔξω δι' ἐκεῖνον ἀκούομεν, ἐκείνου δὲ ψοφοῦντος διὰ τί; τοῦτο γὰρ αὐτὸ λείπεται ζητεῖν. ἀτόπως δὲ καὶ τὸ περὶ τὴν ὄσφρησιν εἴρηκεν. πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ οὐ κοινὴν αἰτίαν ἀπέδωκεν· ἓν μὲν γὰρ ὅλως οὐδ' ἀναπνέει τῶν ὄσφραινομένων. ἔπειτα τὸ μάλιστα ὄσφραίνεσθαι τοὺς πλεῖστον ἐπισπωμένους εὔηθες· οὐδὲν γὰρ ὄφελος μὴ ὑγιαίνουσης ἢ μὴ ἀνεωιγμένης πῶς τῆς αἰσθήσεως. πολλοῖς δὲ συμβαίνει πεπηρῶσθαι καὶ ὅλως μηδὲν αἰσθάνεσθαι. πρὸς δὲ τούτοις οἱ δύσπνοοι καὶ οἱ πονοῦντες καὶ οἱ καθεύδοντες μᾶλλον ἢν αἰσθάνοιντο τῶν ὀσμών· τὸν πλεῖστον γὰρ ἔλκουσιν ἀέρα. νῦν δὲ συμβαίνει τὸναντίον.

A 86 §§ 20–21 (continued)

ON THE SENSES 21

But as to hearing: when he makes it arise from sounds within, it is absurd to suppose that he has made clear how creatures hear, by putting a sound inside them as though from a bell. For it is by that bell that we hear things outside; but when the bell itself sounds, by what do we hear it? That is precisely the question still to be asked. What he has said about smell is absurd too. First, he has not given a cause that covers all cases, for some creatures that smell do not breathe at all. Then it is silly to say that those smell best who draw in the most breath: drawing breath is of no use if the sense is not healthy, or is not opened in some way. Many are maimed in it and perceive nothing at all. Besides, those short of breath, and those at hard labour, and those asleep would perceive odours better, for they draw in the most air. In fact the opposite happens.

The refutation, continued; one objection is drawn from botany.

Two objections of very different weight. The one about hearing is a genuine regress and is still recognisable as a live problem: explaining perception by an inner event only pushes the question back a step, and Theophrastus says so in one sentence. The one about fragrant plants is an appeal to the facts, and it is a good one — if smelling is losing substance, the most fragrant things should waste fastest, and they do not. The last remark of § 20 is the most interesting of all: under Love, where everything is drawn together and nothing flows off, there could be no perception. Theophrastus has noticed that Empedocles' physics of the cycle and his physics of the senses do not sit easily together.

Bearing on Volume I. Bears on B 27 and B 28, the Sphere under Love, where nothing moves and nothing flows.

2 συμβαίνει δέ Diels: συμβαίνειν in the manuscripts. — 4 φθείρειν in the manuscripts: corrected by Schneider. — 8 the sound made inside is Empedocles' own comparison; κώδωναξ in the manuscripts, corrected by Sturz. — 9 ἐκείνον Schneider: ἐκεῖνα in the manuscripts. — 14 πληρωσθαι in the manuscripts: corrected by Coray.

A 86 §§ 22-23

ON THE SENSES 22

οὐ γὰρ ἴσως καθ' αὐτὸ τὸ ἀναπνεῖν αἴτιον τῆς ὀσφρήσεως, ἀλλὰ κατὰ συμβεβηκός, ὥς ἔκ τε τῶν ἄλλων ζώων μαρτυρεῖται καὶ διὰ τῶν εἰρημένων παθῶν· ὁ δ' ὥς ταύτης οὐσης τῆς αἰτίας καὶ ἐπὶ τέλει πάλιν εἴρηκεν ὥσπερ ἐπισημαινόμενος ὧδε ... ὁσμῶν. οὐκ ἀληθές <δὲ> οὐδὲ τὸ μάλιστα ὀσφραίνεσθαι τῶν κούφων, ἀλλὰ δεῖ καὶ ὁσμὴν ἐνυπάρχειν. ὁ γὰρ ἀήρ καὶ τὸ πῦρ κουφότατα μέν, οὐ ποιοῦσι δὲ αἴσθησιν ὁσμῆς.

ON THE SENSES 23

ὥσαύτως δ' ἂν τις καὶ περὶ τὴν φρόνησιν ἀπορήσειεν, εἰ γὰρ τῶν αὐτῶν ποιεῖ καὶ τὴν αἴσθησιν. καὶ γὰρ ἅπαντα μετέξει τοῦ φρονεῖν. καὶ ἅμα πῶς ἐνδέχεται καὶ ἐν ἀλλοιώσει καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ ὁμοίου γίνεσθαι τὸ φρονεῖν; τὸ γὰρ ὁμοιον οὐκ ἀλλοιοῦται τῷ ὁμοίῳ. τὸ δὲ διὴ τῷ αἵματι φρονεῖν καὶ παντελῶς ἄτοπον· πολλὰ γὰρ τῶν ζώων ἄναυμα. τῶν δὲ ἐναίμων τὰ περὶ τὰς αἰσθήσεις ἀναμύοτατα τῶν μερῶν. ἔτι καὶ ὁστοῦν καὶ θριξ αἰσθάνοιτ' ἂν, ἐπεὶ οὖν ἐξ ἀπάντων ἐστὶ τῶν στοιχείων. καὶ συμβαίνει ταῦτόν εἶναι τὸ φρονεῖν καὶ αἰσθάνεσθαι καὶ ἡδεσθαι καὶ <τὸ> λυπεῖσθαι καὶ ἀγνοεῖν· ἅμφω γὰρ ποιεῖ τοῖς ἀνομοίοις. ὥσθ' ἅμα τῷ μὲν ἀγνοεῖν ἔδει γίνεσθαι λύπην, τῷ δὲ φρονεῖν ἡδονήν.

A 86 §§ 22-23

Breathing is not the cause of smell; and the trouble with thinking by blood

ON THE SENSES 22

For breathing is presumably not the cause of smelling in itself but incidentally, as is attested both by the other animals and by the conditions just mentioned. But he, taking this to be the cause, has said it over again at the end, as though setting his seal on it: "thus ... of odours." Nor is it true that the lightest things are the most smelled; an odour must also be present in them. For air and fire are the lightest of all, and yet produce no perception of odour.

ON THE SENSES 23

In the same way one might raise difficulties about thought, if he produces it and perception from the same things. For then everything will share in thinking. And at the same time, how can thinking come about both in an alteration and by the like? For the like is not altered by the like. And that we think with blood is altogether absurd: many animals are bloodless, and in those that have blood the parts about the sense-organs have least of it. Further, bone and hair would perceive, since they too are made of all the elements. And it follows that thinking and perceiving and taking pleasure and being pained and being ignorant are all one; for he produces both by unlikes, so that ignorance would have to be attended by pain, and thinking by pleasure.

The refutation, continued.

The objection that bone and hair would perceive is a fair one, and it follows from A 78: if everything is a ratio of the four roots, and perception is what the roots do when they meet their likes, then there is nothing to stop a hair from thinking. Theophrastus has put together two doctrines from different parts of the poem and drawn out what neither says on its own. Note also the small observational point tucked into the middle — that in blooded animals the sense organs are the parts with least blood in them.

Bearing on Volume I. Bears on B 105, where thought is the blood about the heart.

20 {δέ} Schneider. — 23 εἰ γάρ] compare ἐπεὶ οὖν at line 28. — 27 ἐναίμων Schneider: ἀναίμων in the manuscripts. — 29 ταῦτόν Stephanus: τοῦτο in the manuscripts. — 30 {τό} Schneider; the second τό deleted by Wimmer. The quotation is fragment B 102.

A 86 § 24

ON THE SENSES 24

ἄτοπον δὲ καὶ τὸ τὰς δυνάμεις ἐκάστοις ἐγγίνεσθαι διὰ τὴν ἐν τοῖς μορίοις τοῦ αἵματος σύγκρασιν, ὥς ἢ τὴν γλῶτταν αἰτίαν τοῦ εὖ λέγειν <οὔσαν ἢ> τὰς χεῖρας τοῦ δημιουργεῖν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ὀργάνου τάξιν ἔχοντα. διὸ καὶ μᾶλλον ἂν τις ἀποδοίη τῇ μορφῇ τὴν αἰτίαν ἢ τῇ κράσει τοῦ αἵματος, ἢ χωρὶς διανοίας ἐστίν· οὕτως γὰρ ἔχει καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων ζώων. Ἐ. μὲν οὖν ἔοικεν ἐν πολλοῖς διαμαρτάνειν.

A 86 § 24

The last objection: an organ is an instrument, not a cause

ON THE SENSES 24

It is absurd, too, that the faculties should arise in each part through the blending of the blood in it — as though the tongue were the cause of speaking well, ⟨or⟩ the hands the cause of craftsmanship, and not rather that they hold the rank of an instrument. One would do better to assign the cause to the form than to the blend of the blood, which is without intelligence. For so it stands with the other animals too. Empedocles, then, appears to go wrong in a good many places.

The close of the chapter, and Theophrastus's verdict.

The chapter ends on the distinction that divides the whole of Greek natural philosophy: whether the cause of a thing is its matter or its form. Empedocles put it in the matter — the blend of blood in the hand is why the hand can make things — and Theophrastus, standing in Aristotle's tradition, answers that a hand is an instrument and an instrument is not a cause. The verdict in the last sentence is measured rather than dismissive: not that Empedocles was foolish, but that in many places he goes wrong. He had, after all, just spent eighteen sections taking him seriously.

Bearing on Volume I. Closes the theory of perception that A 78 and B 96 begin.

33 (οὐσαν ἦ) supplied by Diels.

A 87

ARISTOTLE, ON COMING-TO-BE AND PASSING-AWAY

τοῖς μὲν οὖν δοκεῖ πάσχειν ἕκαστον διὰ τινων πόρων εἰσιόντος τοῦ ποιοῦντος ἐσχάτου καὶ κυριωτάτου, καὶ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον καὶ ὄρᾶν καὶ ἀκούειν ἡμᾶς φασι καὶ τὰς ἄλλας αἰσθήσεις αἰσθάνεσθαι πάσας, ἔτι δὲ ὀρᾶσθαι διὰ τε ἀέρος καὶ ὕδατος καὶ τῶν διαφανῶν, διὰ τὸ πόρους ἔχειν ὁράτους μὲν διὰ μικρότητα, πυκνοὺς δὲ καὶ κατὰ στοῖχον, καὶ μᾶλλον ἔχειν τὰ διαφανῆ μᾶλλον. οἱ μὲν οὖν ἐπὶ τινων οὕτω διώρισαν, ὥσπερ καὶ Ἐ., οὐ μόνον ἐπὶ τῶν ποιούντων καὶ πασχόντων, ἀλλὰ καὶ μείγνυσθαι φησιν, ὅσων οἱ πόροι σύμμετροι πρὸς ἀλλήλους εἰσίν.

PHILOPONUS, ON COMING-TO-BE AND PASSING-AWAY

ἀναγκαῖον, φησί, τῷ Ἐμπεδοκλεῖ λέγειν εἶναί τινα στερεὰ καὶ ἀδιαίρετα διὰ τὸ μὴ εἶναι πάντη τοῦ σώματος πόρους συνεχεῖς. τοῦτο γὰρ ἀδύνατον· πόρος γὰρ ἂν εἴη τὸ πᾶν σῶμα καὶ κενόν. ὥστε εἰ τοῦτο ἄτοπον, ἀνάγκη τὰ μὲν ἀπτόμενα μόρια τοῦ σώματος στερεὰ εἶναι ἀδιαίρετα, τὰ δὲ μεταξὺ αὐτῶν κενά, οὓς Ἐ. πόρους ἐκάλεσεν.

PHILOPONUS, ON COMING-TO-BE AND PASSING-AWAY

ἴσμεν δὲ ὅτι οἱ τοὺς πόρους ὑποτιθέμενοι οὐ κενοὺς ὑπετίθεντο τούτους, ἀλλὰ πεπληρωμένους λεπτομερεστέρου τινὸς σώματος οἶον ἀέρος. ταύτη γὰρ διέφερον τῶν τὸ κενὸν ὑποτιθεμένων. — διαφέρουσι δὲ τοῦ κενοῦ οἱ πόροι, διότι οἱ τοὺς πόρους εἰσάγοντες κενὸν εἶναι οὐκ ἔλεγον.

A 87

Pores and solid parts, and whether a pore is a void

ARISTOTLE, ON COMING-TO-BE AND PASSING-AWAY

Some hold that each thing is acted upon when the ultimate and most authoritative agent enters through certain passages; and they say that this is how we see and hear and have all the other perceptions; and further that things are seen through air and water and the transparent bodies, because these have passages invisible on account of their smallness, but close-packed and set in rows — and the more transparent a body is, the more of them it has. Some laid this down for certain cases only, as Empedocles did, not for agents and patients alone: he says that things mix as well, whenever their passages are commensurate with one another.

PHILOPONUS, ON COMING-TO-BE AND PASSING-AWAY

Empedocles, he says, is bound to admit that there are certain solid and indivisible bodies, since the passages of a body cannot run continuously throughout it. That is impossible: the whole body would then be passage, and void. So if that is absurd, the parts of the body that touch one another must be solid and indivisible, and the spaces between them empty — which is what Empedocles called passages.

PHILOPONUS, ON COMING-TO-BE AND PASSING-AWAY

But we know that those who posited passages did not posit them as empty, but as filled with some body of finer parts, such as air. It was in just this that they differed from those who posited the void. — Passages differ from void in this, that those who introduce passages did not say that void exists.

A 87 (continued)

PSEUDO-PHILOPONUS, ON THE GENERATION OF ANIMALS

Ἐ. ἐν ἅπασιν τοῖς σώμασιν τοῖς ὑπὸ σελήνην, οἷον ὕδασιν, ἐλαίοις καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις, εἶναι ἔλεγεν, ὥς καὶ ἐν τῇ Περι γενέσεως καὶ φθορᾶς εἵρηκεν, ἀναμειγμένους πόρους καὶ ναστά, καὶ τοὺς μὲν πόρους ἐκάλεσε κοῖλα, τὰ δὲ ναστά πυκνά.

A 88

AËTIUS

Ἐ. κατ' ἀπορροίας τὰς συνισταμένας μὲν ἐπὶ τῆς ἐπιφανείας τοῦ κατόπτρου, πλουμένας δ' ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐκκρινομένου ἐκ τοῦ κατόπτρου πυρώδους καὶ τὸν προκείμενον ἄερα, εἰς ὃν φέρεται τὰ ρεύματα, συμμεταφέροντος.

A 87 (continued)

PSEUDO-PHILOPONUS, ON THE GENERATION OF ANIMALS

Empedocles said that in all bodies below the moon — waters, oils and the rest — there are passages and solid parts mixed together, as he also said in *On Coming-to-be and Passing-away*; and he called the passages "hollows" and the solid parts "close-packed."

Report, with three later commentators arguing over what a passage is.

Here the same commentator argues against himself across three passages of one book, and the disagreement is worth more than a verdict would be. Philoponus first reasons that Empedocles must, whether he likes it or not, have committed himself to void and to indivisible solids — which would make him an atomist in spite of himself. Then, twice, he insists that the men who posited passages expressly denied the void and took the passages to be full of finer stuff. The second is almost certainly right, and A 86 § 13 shows Theophrastus pressing exactly the same difficulty seven centuries earlier.

Bearing on Volume I. The pore doctrine underlying the whole of A 86, stated here in its own terms.

4 φησιν in L: φασιν in the other manuscripts.

A 88

Images in a mirror

AËTIUS

Empedocles [explains reflections] by effluences, which gather on the surface of the mirror and are compacted by the fiery stuff given off from the mirror — which also carries along with it the air lying in front, into which the streams travel.

Doxographic report, one sentence, and technical.

A reflection, on this account, is a physical deposit: the effluences of the object arrive at the glass and are pressed into a film there by fire coming the other way. Nothing is at any point immaterial, and nothing travels instantaneously.

19 πλουμένας is the reading of Stobaeus; the ps.-Plutarch branch has the false τελειουμένας.

A 89

ALEXANDER OF APHRODISIAS, QUESTIONS

περὶ τῆς Ἡρακλείας λίθου διὰ τί ἔλκει τὸν σίδηρον. Ἐ. μὲν ταῖς ἀπορροαῖς ταῖς ἀπ' ἀμφοτέρων καὶ τοῖς πόροις τοῖς τῆς λίθου συμμέτροις οὓσιν ταῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ σιδήρου τὸν σίδηρον φέρεσθαι λέγει πρὸς τὴν λίθον· αἱ μὲν γὰρ ταύτης ἀπόρροαι τὸν ἀέρα τὸν ἐπὶ τοῖς τοῦ σιδήρου πόροις ἀπωθοῦσί τε καὶ κινουσι τὸν ἐπιπωματίζοντα αὐτούς· τούτου δὲ χωρισθέντος ἀθρόαι ἀπορροαὶ ρεούσῃ τὸν σίδηρον ἔπεσθαι· φερομένων δὲ τῶν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἀπορροαῶν ἐπὶ τοὺς τῆς λίθου πόρους, διὰ τὸ συμμέτρος τε αὐτοῖς εἶναι καὶ ἐναρμόζειν καὶ τὸν σίδηρον σὺν ταῖς ἀπορροαῖς ἔπεσθαί τε καὶ φέρεσθαι.

A 89

Why the lodestone draws iron — and four objections to the answer

ALEXANDER OF APHRODISIAS, QUESTIONS

On the Heracleian stone: why it draws iron. Empedocles says the iron travels toward the stone by the effluences from both, and because the passages of the stone are commensurate with the effluences from the iron. For the effluences of the stone push away the air that lies upon the passages of the iron, and move what is stopping them like a lid; and once that has been separated off, the iron follows the effluence as it flows out in a mass. And as the effluences from the iron travel toward the passages of the stone, the iron too follows along with its effluences and is carried, because they are commensurate with those passages and fit into them.

A 89 (continued)

ALEXANDER OF APHRODISIAS, QUESTIONS

ἐπιζητήσαι δ' ἂν τις, εἰ καὶ συγχωρηθεῖη τὸ τῶν ἀπορροϊῶν, τί δῆποτε ὁ λίθος οὐχ ἔπεται ταῖς ἰδίαις ἀπορροαῖς, κινεῖται δὲ πρὸς τὸν σίδηρον. οὐδὲν γὰρ μᾶλλον ἐκ τῶν εἰρημένων ἢ λίθος πρὸς τὸν σίδηρον ἢ ὁ σίδηρος κινήσεται πρὸς τὴν λίθον. ἔτι διὰ τί οὐ καὶ χωρὶς τῆς λίθου κινήσεται ποτε σίδηρος ἐπ' ἄλλο τι τῶν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἀπορροϊῶν ἀθρόων φερομένων. διὰ τί γὰρ μόναι αἱ ἀπὸ τῆς λίθου ἀπόρροιαι κινεῖν δύνανται τὸν ἐπιπωματίζοντα τοὺς τοῦ σιδήρου πόρους ἀέρα καὶ ἐπέχοντα τὰς ἀπορροίας; ἔτι διὰ τί ἄλλο οὐδὲν πρὸς ἄλλο τι οὕτω φέρεται, καίτοι πολλὰ λέγεται ὑπ' αὐτοῦ συμμέτρους τοὺς πόρους ταῖς ἀπορροαῖς ἔχειν; λέγει γοῦν· ὕδωρ κτλ.

A 89 (continued)

ALEXANDER OF APHRODISIAS, QUESTIONS

But one might ask — even granting the doctrine of effluences — why on earth the stone does not follow its own effluences, whereas the iron moves toward it. For nothing in what has been said makes the stone move toward the iron any more than the iron toward the stone. Again, why does the iron not sometimes move toward something else, without the stone present, when its own effluences travel out in a mass? Why can the effluences of the stone alone move the air that caps the passages of the iron and holds the effluences back? And again, why does nothing else travel toward anything else in this way, although he says of many things that their passages are commensurate with the effluences? At any rate he says: "water ..."

Report, very likely from a lost work of Theophrastus, with the reporter's own criticism.

This is the earliest surviving theory of magnetism, and it is an achievement of a particular kind: Empedocles refuses to treat attraction as a sympathy or an occult power and insists on a mechanism made of the same stuff as everything else. Alexander's four objections are all good ones, and the first is devastating — the account is symmetrical, and gives no reason why the iron should move rather than the stone. That difficulty would not be answered for two thousand years.

Bearing on Volume I. B 91, where oil and water are said not to mix, is the fragment Alexander cites; the pore doctrine is A 87.

25 ταύτης from the apographs: τούτου in V. — 34 αὐτῆς in V, corrected by Apelt. — 38 πρὸς ἄλληλα is deleted by Kranz; λέγεις in V, corrected by Spengel. The quotation is fragment B 91.

A 90

AĒTIUS

Ἐ. καὶ πρὸς τὸ διὰ τῶν ἀκτίνων καὶ πρὸς τὸ διὰ τῶν εἰδώλων
ἐκδοχὰς παρέχεται. πλείους δὲ πρὸς <τὸ> δεύτερον· τὰς γὰρ
ἀπορροΐας ἀποδέχεται.

A 90

Rays or images?

AËTIUS

Empedocles supplies grounds both for the view that we see by rays and for the view that we see by images; but more for the second, since he accepts effluences.

Doxographic report, and a rare admission that a source held both views.

The two theories divided ancient optics: either something goes out from the eye, or something comes in from the object. The doxographer's difficulty is that Empedocles is quoted for both — the lantern of B 84 sends fire out, the effluences of A 89 and A 92 come in. The honest reading is that he held both at once, and that the meeting of the two is what seeing was.

Bearing on Volume I. B 84 is the outgoing half; A 92 is the incoming half.

41 (τό) supplied by Diels.

A 91

ARISTOTLE, ON SENSE AND SENSE-OBJECTS

ἐκεῖνως δ' αὐτὸς αὐτὸν ὁρᾷ ὁ ὀφθαλμός, ὥσπερ καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀνακλάσει, ἐπεὶ εἴ γε πῦρ ἦν, καθάπερ Ἐ. φησι καὶ ἐν τῷ Τιμαίῳ γέγραπται, καὶ συνέβαινε τὸ ὁρᾶν ἐξιόντος ὥσπερ ἐκ λαμπτήρος τοῦ φωτός, διὰ τί οὐ καὶ ἐν τῷ σκότει ἐώρα ἂν ἡ ὄψις;

ARISTOTLE, ON THE GENERATION OF ANIMALS

τὸ μὲν οὖν ὑπολαμβάνειν τὰ μὲν γλαυκὰ πυρώδη, καθάπερ Ἐ. φησιν, τὰ δὲ μέλανα πλεῖον ὕδατος ἔχειν ἢ πυρός, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τὰ μὲν ἡμέρας οὐκ ὀξὺ βλέπειν, τὰ γλαυκά, δι' ἔνδειαν ὕδατος, θάτερα δὲ νύκτωρ δι' ἔνδειαν πυρός, οὐ λέγεται καλῶς, εἴπερ μὴ πυρὸς τὴν ὄψιν θετέον, ἀλλ' ὕδατος πᾶσιν.

A 91

Fire in the eye, and why grey eyes and dark eyes differ

ARISTOTLE, ON SENSE AND SENSE-OBJECTS

The eye sees itself in that other way, as it does in reflection. For if the eye were fire, as Empedocles says and as is written in the *Timaeus*, and seeing came about by light going out as from a lantern, why would the sight not see in the dark as well?

ARISTOTLE, ON THE GENERATION OF ANIMALS

To suppose that grey eyes are fiery, as Empedocles says, and that dark eyes have more water in them than fire, and that this is why the grey do not see sharply by day, for want of water, and the dark do not by night, for want of fire — this is not well said, if the sight is to be held to consist not of fire but of water in every case.

Report in two places, both hostile.

Aristotle's objection is the same one for two thousand years: a lamp shines in the dark, and an eye does not. What it does not touch is the reply Empedocles had already given at A 86 § 8 and here at A 91 — that the eye's fire must be met by fire from outside, and that an eye too rich in fire is blinded by day rather than helped. The theory is wrong, but it is not wrong in the simple way the objection assumes.

Bearing on Volume I. B 84, the lantern; and A 86 § 8, where the day-and-night doctrine is set out in full.

6 μέλανα in Z: μελανόμματα in PS; μεγαλόμματα in Y.

A 92

PLATO, MENO

Βούλει οὖν σοι κατὰ Γοργίαν ἀποκρίνωμαι ἢ ἂν σὺ μάλιστα ἀκολουθήσῃς; — Βούλομαι· πῶς γὰρ οὐ. — Οὐκοῦν λέγετε ἀπορροάς τινας τῶν ὄντων κατὰ Ἐμπεδοκλέα; — Σφόδρα γε. — Καὶ πόρους εἰς οὓς καὶ δι' ὧν αἱ ἀπόρροαι πορεύονται; — Πάνυ γε. — Καὶ τῶν ἀπορροῶν τὰς μὲν ἀρμόττειν ἐνίοις τῶν πόρων, τὰς δὲ ἐλάττους ἢ μείζους εἶναι; — Ἔστι ταῦτα. — Οὐκοῦν καὶ ὄψιν καλεῖς τι; — Ἔγωγε. — Ἐκ τούτων δὴ σύνεες ὅ τοι λέγω, ἔφη Πίνδαρος· ἔστιν γὰρ χροὰ ἀπορροὴ σωμάτων ὅψει σύμμετρος καὶ αἰσθητός.

AËTIUS

Ἐ. χρῶμα εἶναι ἀπεφαίνεται τὸ τοῖς πόροις τῆς ὄψεως ἐναρμόττον. τέτταρα δὲ τοῖς στοιχείοις ἰσάριθμα, λευκὸν μέλαν ἐρυθρὸν ὠχρόν.

A 92

Colour is an effluence commensurate with sight

PLATO, MENO

"Shall I answer you in Gorgias' manner, in the way you would most easily follow?" — "Do; why not?" — "Then you people speak, with Empedocles, of certain effluences of the things that are?" — "Very much so." — "And of passages, into which and through which the effluences travel?" — "Certainly." — "And that some of the effluences fit some of the passages, while others are too small or too large?" — "That is so." — "And you call something sight?" — "I do." — "From these, then, 'understand what I am telling you,' as Pindar said: colour is an effluence of bodies, commensurate with sight and perceptible."

AËTIUS

Empedocles declared that colour is what fits the passages of the sight; and that there are four colours, equal in number to the elements — white, black, red and yellow.

Reception, from a dialogue of Plato's, with a doxographic notice attached.

Socrates offers this as a specimen of the kind of definition he does not want — impressive, technical, and explaining nothing — and the joke is that Meno likes it. But the passage is precious for all that: it is a summary of Empedocles' optics given by someone who assumed his audience knew it, and it confirms both halves of the doctrine, effluence and commensurate pore. The four colours of the Aëtius notice square badly with A 69a and B 94, where only white and black are named, and with Theophrastus' objection at A 86 § 17 that grey fits nowhere.

Bearing on Volume I. Confirms A 87 and A 89; sits awkwardly beside A 69a and B 94.

16 σωμαίων Diels, following Alexander's On Sense: σχημάτων in BT, with χρημάτων noted in T.

A 93

AËTIUS

Ἐ. τὴν ἀκοὴν γίνεσθαι κατὰ πρόσπτωσιν πνεύματος τῷ χονδρώδει, ὅπερ φησὶν ἐξηρτηῆσθαι ἐντὸς τοῦ ὥτὸς κώδωνος δίκην αἰωρούμενον καὶ τυπτόμενον.

A 94

AËTIUS

Ἐ. ταῖς ἀναπνοαῖς ταῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύμονος συνεισκρίνεσθαι τὴν ὁσμὴν· ὅταν γοῦν ἡ ἀναπνοὴ βαρεῖα γένηται, κατὰ τραχύτητα μὴ συναισθάνεσθαι, ὥς ἐπὶ τῶν ρευματιζομένων.

ARISTOTLE, ON SENSE AND SENSE-OBJECTS

ἡ δὲ γεῦσις ἀφή τίς ἐστιν. ἡ μὲν οὖν τοῦ ὕδατος φύσις βούλεται ἄχυμος εἶναι. ἀνάγκη δ' ἡ ἐν αὐτῷ τὸ ὕδωρ ἔχειν τὰ γένη τῶν χυμῶν ἀναίσθητα διὰ μικρότητα, καθάπερ Ἐ. φησιν, ἢ κτλ.

A 93

The bell inside the ear

AËTIUS

Empedocles: hearing comes about by the impact of breath upon the cartilaginous part, which he says hangs inside the ear, swinging like a bell and being struck.

Doxographic report, and the source of a famous image.

Compare A 86 § 9, where Theophrastus gives the same image and then objects to it: if we hear outside things by the bell, what do we hear the bell by? The notice here has kept the image and lost the objection, which is the usual direction of travel.

Bearing on Volume I. B 99, the "sprout of flesh."

20 χόνδρῳ in Stobaeus.

A 94

Smell comes in with the breath; and whether water has flavours in it

AËTIUS

Empedocles: the smell is drawn in together with the breaths from the lung; at any rate, when the breathing becomes heavy, by reason of roughness one does not perceive it — as happens with those who have a catarrh.

ARISTOTLE, ON SENSE AND SENSE-OBJECTS

Taste is a kind of touch. Now the nature of water tends to be without flavour. But either water must have in itself the kinds of flavour, imperceptible because of their smallness, as Empedocles says, or ...

Report, with a second witness on taste.

The head-cold is the evidence, and it is a good piece of evidence: blocked breathing and lost smell go together, and the inference from the one to the other is sound even though the mechanism is not. The Aristotle passage supplies what Theophrastus said Empedocles had left out — an account of taste — and it turns on the same principle as everything else, that what is too small to be perceived singly is present all the same.

Bearing on Volume I. Fills the gap Theophrastus noted at A 86 § 9.

19 κατά is the ps.-Plutarch reading: καὶ τῇν in Stobaeus.

A 95

AËTIUS

Παρμενίδης, Ἐ. ἐλλείψει τροφῆς τὴν ὄρεξιν. — Ἐ. τὰς ἡδονὰς γίνεσθαι τοῖς μὲν ὁμοίοις (ἐκ) τῶν ὁμοίων, κατὰ δὲ τὸ ἐλλεῖπον πρὸς τὴν ἀναπλήρωσιν, ὥστε τῷ ἐλλείποντι ἢ ὄρεξις τοῦ ὁμοίου. τὰς δ' ἀλγηδόνας τοῖς ἐναντίοις· ἡλλοτριῶσθαι γὰρ πρὸς ἄλληλα ὅσα διαφέρει κατὰ τε τὴν σύγκρισιν καὶ τὴν τῶν στοιχείων κρᾶσιν.

AËTIUS

Ἐ. τὰς μὲν ὀρέξεις γίνεσθαι τοῖς ζώοις κατὰ τὰς ἐλλείψεις τῶν ἀποτελούντων ἕκαστον στοιχείων, τὰς δὲ ἡδονὰς ἐξ οἰκείου κατὰ τὰς τῶν συγγενῶν καὶ ὁμοίων κράσεις, τὰς δὲ ὀχλήσεις καὶ τὰς (ἀλγηδόνας ἐξ ἀνοικείου).

A 95

Appetite is a lack; pleasure is a like meeting a like

AËTIUS

Parmenides and Empedocles: appetite arises from a lack of nourishment. — Empedocles: pleasures arise for like things out of their likes, and in proportion to what is lacking toward its replenishment, so that the desire for the like belongs to whatever is in want. Pains arise from opposites, for all things that differ in composition and in the blending of the elements have been made alien to one another.

AËTIUS

Empedocles: the appetites of animals arise according to the deficiencies of the elements that make each of them up; pleasures out of what is proper to them, according to the blendings of things akin and alike; and distresses and (pains out of what is alien).

Doxographic report, two notices from different books of the same compilation.

Appetite is here made a physical deficit and nothing else: an animal wants what it is short of, and the wanting is the shortage. It is the doctrine Theophrastus attacked at A 86 §§ 16 and 17, on the ground that we are often pained in the very act of perceiving, and that on this account things grown together should be the most pleased of all.

29 (ἐκ) Meineke; Karsten instead deletes τῶν ὁμοίων. — 31 ἡλλοτριῶσθαι and ἄλληλα are Meineke's and Karsten's corrections of the Stobaeus text. — 35 the words in angle brackets are supplied by Diels.

A 96

AËTIUS

Παρμενίδης καὶ Ἐ. καὶ Δημόκριτος ταὐτὸν νοῦν καὶ ψυχὴν, καθ' οὓς οὐδὲν ἄν εἴη ζῶιον ἄλογον κυρίως.

A 97

AËTIUS

Ἐ. ἐν τῇ τοῦ αἵματος συστάσει.

THEODORET, CURE OF THE GREEK MALADIES

Ἐ. ... τὴν καρδίαν ἀπεκλήρωσαν τούτῳ. καὶ τούτων δ' αὖ πάλιν οἱ μὲν ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ τῆς καρδίας, οἱ δὲ ἐν τῷ αἵματι.

A 96

Mind and soul are the same, so no animal is irrational

AËTIUS

Parmenides and Empedocles and Democritus: mind and soul are the same — on their view, no animal would be irrational in the strict sense.

Doxographic report, one sentence with a large consequence.

The consequence is drawn by the doxographer, not by Empedocles, but it follows from what he says elsewhere and he would not have resisted it. If thinking is a property of a blend, and every animal has a blend, then every animal thinks in its degree. The Purifications, where the wanderer passes into the body of a beast and a bush, requires exactly this.

Bearing on Volume I. The physics behind the transmigration of B 117 and B 127.

A 97

Where the governing part is

AËTIUS

Empedocles: [the governing part is] in the composition of the blood.

THEODORET, CURE OF THE GREEK MALADIES

Empedocles ... they assigned the heart to it. And among these again, some place it in the cavity of the heart, others in the blood.

Doxographic report, with a Christian witness added.

Theodoret has preserved the disagreement rather than resolving it, which makes him useful here. B 105 says the blood about the heart, and both halves of that phrase were being pulled at by readers who wanted a single organ.

Bearing on Volume I. B 105.

A 98

CAELIUS AURELIANUS, ON CHRONIC DISEASES

Empedoclem sequentes alium dicunt ex animi purgamento fieri, alium alienatione mentis ex corporis causa sive iniquitate, de quo nunc scripturi sumus; quem Graeci, siquidem magnam faciat anxietatem, adpellant μανίαν.

A 98

Two kinds of madness

CAELIUS AURELIANUS, ON CHRONIC DISEASES

Those who follow Empedocles say that one kind of madness arises from a purification of the soul, and another from a derangement of the mind owing to a bodily cause or disorder — and it is the latter we are now about to write of; which the Greeks, when it produces great distress, call mania.

Report from a Latin medical writer, and the last of the doctrinal testimonia.

The A-testimonia end on the seam that runs through the whole of Empedocles. A physician writing in Latin, and interested only in the second kind, records that the school distinguished two madresses: one with a bodily cause, which is a disease, and one that is a purification of the soul, which is not. The word he uses for it, purgamentum, is the Latin for katharmos — the title of the other poem. Whatever else divided the physics from the religion, the men who read both evidently did not think the division ran through the mind.

Bearing on Volume I. The one testimony that names the Purifications and the medical writings in a single sentence.

quam, in the manuscripts before adpellant, is deleted by Diels.

APPENDIX I: IN ANTIQUITY

What the ancient world made of him

The testimonia in this volume are evidence about Empedocles. They are also, read the other way, evidence about the people quoting him, and a reader who has come this far will have noticed that the ancient world could not settle what kind of thing he was.

The physicians claimed him. Galen at A 3 names him with Pausanias and Philistion as one of the medical schools of Italy, set beside Cos and Cnidus — not a philosopher with an interest in medicine but a tradition of doctoring with pupils of its own. Soranus at A 79 and A 80 cites him in a working obstetrical handbook, once to follow him and once to correct him. Caelius Aurelianus, closing the A-testimonia at A 98, reports that his school distinguished two kinds of madness, one bodily and one a purification of the soul.

The philosophers disputed him. Aristotle is the most frequent witness in this book and almost always an opponent; but at A 78 he concedes the one point that mattered, that bone is not an element nor a heap of elements but the ratio of their mixture, and that on this Empedocles was "led by the truth itself." Theophrastus gave him a whole chapter, printed here as A 86, and used eighteen sections of it to take him apart. Plato names him once, in the *Meno* at A 92, and then only to offer his optics as a specimen of the kind of definition that impresses without explaining — and in the *Phaedo* at A 76, without naming him at all, as one of the questions a young man could not make come out.

The oldest surviving criticism is not philosophical but professional. The Hippocratic writer at A 71 does not say Empedocles is wrong about what a man is; he says the question is out of place, and that a physician who begins from the origin of the cosmos has begun in the wrong century. That was written within living memory of him, possibly within his lifetime.

And the critics could not decide whether he was a poet. Aristotle's verdict at A 22 — that he and Homer share nothing but the metre — settled the matter for most of European criticism, and A 24 and A 25 collect the echoes. What the verdict conceals is that nobody denied the verse was good: Aristotle's complaint in the *Rhetoric* is that it is too persuasive, carrying an audience along as an oracle does, and Cicero's joke at A 25 concedes in passing that the poem was excellent. What they could not name was a man who had written the best poem in a kind they did not think was poetry.

The warmest ancient reader was a Roman who disagreed with him about everything. Lucretius' praise stands at A 21; what follows it there, and is printed below, is the refutation — and the two together are the best single illustration of how antiquity read Empedocles.

Lucretius, On the Nature of Things I 734–741

The lines that follow the praise printed at A 21

*Hic tamen et supra quos diximus inferiores
partibus egregie multis multoque minores,
quamquam multa bene ac divinitus invenientes
ex adyto tamquam cordis responsa dedere
sanctius et multo certa ratione magis quam
Pythia quae tripodi a Phoebi lauroque profatur,
principiis tamen in rerum fecere ruinas
et graviter magni magno cecidere ibi casu.*

Yet this man, and those we spoke of above — lesser than he, and by many degrees and much the smaller — though they found out much that was good and god-given, and delivered answers as though from the shrine of the heart, more holy and far more certainly reasoned than anything the Pythia utters from Apollo's tripod and laurel: these men, for all that, came to ruin over the first principles of things, and, great as they were, fell there, and fell heavily.

Sixty lines of demolition follow. The charges are the standard Epicurean ones — that Empedocles denies the void while requiring motion, that his elements are soft and rare and so cannot be ultimate, that he allows no limit to division. But the terms of the praise are not withdrawn: the oracle from the shrine of the heart is meant, and so is the comparison with Delphi, in a poem whose whole purpose is to abolish oracles. Lucretius has found the exact register for a predecessor who was right about the method and wrong about the answer, and no Greek source manages anything so generous. The text is Munro's; most editors read *hi* for the manuscripts' *hic* in the first line, which makes the plural govern the whole sentence.

APPENDIX II: AFTER ANTIQUITY

The man of the crater

Diels stops where antiquity stops, and so does the Loeb. But Empedocles did not stop being read, and what happened to him afterwards is worth setting down, because it is a case of a reputation being decided by the one part of the evidence that the best ancient historian had already disproved.

Timaeus demolished the leap into Etna at A 1 §§ 71 and 72, and he did it with arguments a modern historian would make: the host's estate was in the wrong city, the friend who supposedly witnessed a deification put up no monument and could easily afford one, and Empedocles, who wrote at length about fire, never once mentions the volcano. Diogenes Laertius prints the demolition. It made no difference. Four of the five witnesses below know Empedocles chiefly as the man who jumped, and the fifth knows him for a doctrine he met only in a refutation.

Dante, Inferno IV 135–138

The philosophers of Limbo

*che innanzi agli altri più presso gli stanno;
Democrito, che il mondo a caso pone,
Diogenès, Anassagora e Tale,
Empedoclès, Eraclito e Zenone;*

who stand before the others and nearest to him: Democritus, who sets the world down to chance; Diogenes, Anaxagoras and Thales; Empedocles, Heraclitus and Zeno.

The virtuous pagans, in the castle of the noble spirits, ranked around Aristotle. Dante's commentators gloss the name as "of Acragas, author of a poem on nature and on the first principles of things," which is exactly right and suggests the fourteenth century still knew what he had written, if not the writing.

Dante, Inferno XII 40–43

An earthquake, and a doctrine

*da tutte parti l'alta valle feda
tremò sì, ch'io pensai che l'universo
sentisse amor, per lo qual è chi creda
più volte il mondo in caos converso;*

on every side the deep foul valley shook so that I thought the universe felt love — through which, as some believe, the world has more than once been turned back into chaos.

This is the more interesting of the two, because it is doctrine and not a name. The trembling of Hell at the Crucifixion reminds Dante of the theory that when Love prevails the elements are drawn back together into an undifferentiated mass. That is the Sphairos of B 27 and A 41, and Dante has it right. His commentators note that he can only have met it in Aristotle, who reports the doctrine in order to refute it — so the one piece of Empedoclean physics to reach the *Commedia* travelled there inside its own refutation.

John Milton, *Paradise Lost* III 469–473

The Paradise of Fools

*Others came single; he, who to be deemed
A god, leaped fondly into Ætna flames,
Empedocles; and he who, to enjoy
Plato's Elysium, leaped into the sea,
Cleombrotus; and many more too long,*

Blown, with the friars and the relics and the indulgences, into the Limbo of Vanity on the backside of the world. Milton has taken the story from Horace at A 16 and kept Horace's verdict in the single word fondly — foolishly, from vanity. What has been lost between Diogenes and Milton is that anyone ever doubted it; the leap is now simply what Empedocles did, and the reason for it is simply what Hippobotus said it was.

Matthew Arnold, *Empedocles on Etna* II 402–416

The last speech, 1852

*And therefore, O ye elements, I know—
Ye know it too—it hath been granted me
Not to die wholly, not to be all enslav'd.
I feel it in this hour! The numbing cloud
Mounts off my soul; I feel it, I breathe free!
Is it but for a moment?
Ah! boil up, ye vapours!
Leap and roar, thou sea of fire!
My soul glows to meet you.
Ere it flag, ere the mists
Of despondency and gloom
Rush over it again,
Receive me! Save me! [He plunges into the crater.*

Arnold's Empedocles is a modern man, isolated by his own intelligence, and the crater is a release rather than a fraud — the exact inversion of Hippobotus, who made the leap a bid for a reputation, and of Milton, who made it vanity. Arnold kept Pausanias, who is in the poem from its first scene, and kept the physician

too; what he could not keep was the physics, and the speech turns on a word — elements — that has quietly changed meaning since B 6. He withdrew the poem from his collected edition in 1853 on the ground that it depicted a suffering that found no vent in action, and restored it only in 1867 at Browning's urging.

Two things follow from this sequence. The first is that the modern Empedocles descends from Hippobotus, a late compiler, by way of Horace's joke, and not from Timaeus, who examined the evidence — and that a reputation, once it has found a good story, is not much affected by being refuted. The second is that the part of him which survived is the part this volume can do least with. Hölderlin left three drafts of a *Tod des Empedokles* and finished none, Nietzsche planned a drama and abandoned it, and both were working on the crater. Nothing of that is testimony, and so nothing of it is printed here beyond this notice; but a reader who wonders why the name is famous while the doctrine is not will find the answer in the four pages above.