

Heraclides' *On Soul* (?) and Its Ancient Readers

Inna Kupreeva

The doxographical tradition attributes to Heraclides a theory of light-like, *phôtoeidês*, soul. The source of this doctrine is usually considered to be the dialogue which contains a story of cosmic vision experienced by Empedotimus of Syracuse. The details of the story preserved in a handful of fragments were variously interpreted as parts of a cosmological picture endowed with eschatological significance, and there has been a tendency among scholars to regard Heraclides' position as some sort of middle ground between the mind-body dualism underlying the theories of soul in Plato's Academy and the naturalism of Aristotle's later psychological doctrine.

In this paper I review the extant fragments, in an attempt to assess the evidence for the content and method of the work, and discuss a number of questions that have been raised with regard to Heraclides'

* I am grateful to the editors for accepting this paper which was written after the conference and for their generous help in preparing it for publication. Thanks are owed also to Jan Bremmer, Damian Caluori, Bill Fortenbaugh, Dominic O'Meara, and Eckart Schütrumpf who read the final draft and saved me from a number of errors (the ones that remain are my own).

theory of soul. The paper falls into three parts. In the first, I discuss the number and length of the fragments, the title, the main character(s) and the plot. The second is devoted to the content of Empedotimus' vision and its interpretation in later sources, with a view to establishing the doctrinal implications of the myth. Finally, in the third part, I discuss the texts regarded as evidence for the theory of light-like soul in an attempt to reconstruct Heraclides' theory of soul.

1. *On Soul: The Sources*

1.1 *Fragments*¹

The fragments collected by Wehrli in the section *Seelenlehre* can be divided into three groups: (a) testimonia: the mention of the title occurs in Plutarch (49) and could be surmised perhaps from Proclus' *Commentary on Plato's Republic* (54A); (b) the story of Empedotimus (52–8); (c) the doctrine of soul as light-like body (46–8; 50).

Before Wehrli, Voss printed these fragments in a different arrangement,² and Wilamowitz published the Empedotimus fragments in an appendix to his book *Der Glaube der Hellenen*.³

Wehrli's collection was supplemented by Gottschalk who added a passage from Gregory of Nazianzus, *Or.* 4.59 (= 95B)⁴ and supplied contexts to fr. 96 Wehrli (= 52, Philoponus *On Aristotle's Meteorology* 1.8, 117.10–13)⁵ and 46 (A, C, D).⁶

¹ Generally, I use the concept of fragment as defined in Kidd 1997 (i.e. only the passages where a given author is mentioned by name qualify as fragments), but assume that passages where just Empedotimus is mentioned are also fragments of Heraclides.

² *On Soul*, 28–33 (28 = 49 29 = 46A; 30 = 46C; 31 = 46B; 32 = 47; 33 = 48); *dilogy Abaris ê Peri tôn en Haidou + Empedotimus ê Peri tôn ouranôn* (vel *en ouranôi*): 34–48 (*Abaris*: 34 = 80; 35 = 130; 36 = Proclus *In Plat. Tim.* 2.8.8–10 (not in Wehrli or this collection); 37 = 86; 38 = *Schol. Od.* A 371 (s.n.); 39 = 131 and DL 8.21; 40 = 132; *Empedotimus*: 41 = 54A; 42 = 57; 43 = Plut. *De latenter viv.* 7, cf. Plut. *Consol. ad Apoll.* 35; 44 = 50; 45 = 52; 46 = 53; 47 = DL 1.25; 48 = DL 8.72.

³ Wilamowitz, 1932, 535–9, includes fragments 54A; 56; 50; 53 (noting the reference to Κρονία as mistaken); 55; 57. He attributes these fragments to *Peri tôn en Haidou* (so too Bidez 1945, 54; Dieterich 1893, 129, 3); see discussion in Gottschalk 1980, 99 n. 35.

⁴ Gottschalk 1980, 148–9.

⁵ Gottschalk 1980, 149–54.

⁶ Gottschalk 1980, 154–5.

In an important article,⁷ Whittaker added an epigram by Gregory of Nazianzus (95C),⁸ a passage from Pseudo-Nonnus' *Scholia mythologica* (95D), and, significantly, a passage in Psellus (*Or.* 24, 87, 93 Littlewood = 54B), which is also a fragment of Posidonius not in Theiler or EK and an uncollected fragment of Iamblichus. I have added here Psellus' *Court Speech* 1.898 (= 54C).

Wehrli's fr. 95 (= 58) is now attributed to Damascius in the light of Westerink's work on Alexandrian commentaries.⁹

Wehrli's fr. 100 (= 48) does not mention Heraclides, and although it is likely that Heraclides is referred to as the author of the doctrine, there is no way to attest the argument as his with any certainty.¹⁰ Fr. 103 W. is attributed to Heraclides Lembus.¹¹

Fr. 101 Wehrli (= 51) does not seem to contain anything concerning soul explicitly, but Wehrli hypothesises that Heraclides' advice could be interpreted in the light of his doctrine of light-like soul.¹²

1.2 *Title*

In the list of Heraclides' works in Diogenes Laertius,¹³ we find the following two titles: *On Soul* and *On Soul Specially* (*kat'idian*). The meaning of *kat'idian* is not clear, and the text was suspected early on.¹⁴ Wehrli tentatively assigned all his fragments under the heading

⁷ Whittaker 1997.

⁸ Noted also by Capelle 1917, 42 n.2.

⁹ Westerink, 1959, XV–XX; Westerink 1977, 15–7.

¹⁰ cf. Boyancé *ap.* Wehrli *ad loc.*, Moraux 1963, 1195.

¹¹ See p. 96 and nn. 21, 22 below.

¹² On Democritus' suggestion and tradition about burial in honey, see Cèbe *ad loc.*

¹³ Going back to an early Peripatetic source (Moraux 1951 argues for Hermippus, Wehrli for Sotion as its source). See Wehrli 1969, 64–5; Gottschalk 1980, 6 n. 20; Moraux, 1951, 220–1; Mejer 1978; Sollenberger 1992, 3851–5. The titles of Diogenes' list do not coincide with the titles preserved by other authors, such as Plutarch.

¹⁴ Voss 29 prints the text with Reiske's emendation, i.e. inserting καὶ instead of comma after νοῦ giving: *περὶ νοῦ καὶ περὶ ψυχῆς καὶ κατ' ἰδίαν περὶ ψυχῆς*. The emendation is printed in the apparatus by most modern editors, including Wehrli and most recently Marcovich. There is a lot to be said for it, because it helps to make sense of κατ' ἰδίαν, which Voss correctly cites in parallel with κοινῶς τε περὶ ἀρετῆς (after the list of titles devoted to particular virtues) as an evidence of editorial activity of the compiler of the list. On Reiske's readings of DL, see Diels 1889, 302–5. This would not make it easier to decide where the theory of light-like soul and the story of Empedotimus belong, but would at least eliminate one textual obscurity.

Seelenlehre to these two works, although only one fragment (102 W. = 49) has an explicit reference to the title—and regrettably nothing but the title; the content has no direct connection with the subject. Hirzel suggested, on the basis of the reference made in Justin's epitome of Trogus, that Heraclides' wording (specifically, the identification of the sackers as Hyperboreans) reflects the Delphic oracle through which the ambassador of Massilia learned about the capture of Rome,¹⁵ but this does not seem to be borne out by the text.¹⁶ The fragment confirms the broad date for Heraclides, placing him in the generation of Aristotle;¹⁷ reference to the Hyperboreans and Plutarch's comment about the mix of fact and fiction suggest the kind of plot usual for Heraclides, but there is nothing more specific.¹⁸ Wehrli prints his fr. 103 (= Servius *In Aeneidem* I 273, rejected in this edition)¹⁹ as a tentative parallel to 102 (= 49), on the basis of the fact that in both passages there is an assumption of the Greek origin of Rome.²⁰ But already Jacoby attributed the text of fr. 103 to Heraclides Lembus,²¹ and this attribution has been defended recently by Frascetti.²²

1.3 Empedotimus

This group of fragments goes back to one original work, whatever its title. In modern scholarship, before the details of the story became available from Proclus (54A, 56), the question seems to have been

¹⁵Hirzel 1895 (I), 327 and n.2.

¹⁶The text does not say that the embassy learnt about the sack of Rome from the Oracle, rather that the embassy heard this news on their way back from Delphi. (Just. *Phil. hist.* 43.5.8: *parta pace et securitate fundata, revertentes a Delphis Massiliensium legati, quo missi munera Apollini tolerant, audiverunt urbem Romanam a Gallis captam incensamque*. Here *revertentes* surely modifies *audiverunt*. The Gauls are not called Hyperboreans in this passage, and even assuming that the original oracle (granting that it had been given) was so interpreted by the Massilian people on the basis of their better knowledge of local terrain, further details of the story (collecting gold and silver, 43.5.9–10) are perhaps more in line with Roman than with Delphic tradition.

¹⁷Other contemporary references to the sack of Rome include Aristotle F 703 Gigon and Theopompus *FGrH* 115 F 317.

¹⁸Boyancé 1934 argues that the title *Abaris* refers to *P. dikaiosunês*, cf. Dalfino 1998, 63.

¹⁹Schütrumpf 2008, 266–7.

²⁰So Wehrli *ad* 103.

²¹*FGrH* (840 F 40d).

²²Frascetti 1989, 83–6.

whether Empedotimus was some famous historical character, e.g. a local cultural hero obliterated in later tradition. After the publication of Kroll's edition of Proclus' *Republic* commentary in 1899, the prevailing tendency was to deny any historicity behind Heraclides' anecdote.²³ It was suggested by a number of scholars that Empedotimus is a fictional name, based either on Empedocles or Empedocles + Hermodotimus.²⁴ But in fact there is independent evidence for this name, both epigraphical and literary,²⁵ so even if the name of Empedotimus is a conscious literary allusion made by Heraclides, it is still based on the choice of an existing name rather than a poetic invention.

The main reason for common scepticism about historicity is that we do not have any extant tradition about Empedotimus apart from Heraclides. This does not mean that such a tradition did not exist: arguments *ex silentio* are difficult to sustain,²⁶ but there is no evidence to work with.

The earliest authors reported to mention Empedotimus are Posidonius (54B) and Varro (57). It is likely that both read the dialogue. Heraclides' writings were influential in Cicero's time: Cicero himself and Varro are attested as professing to imitate him;²⁷ Asclepiades of Bithynia is reported to have developed in his physiological theory the

²³Wilamowitz 1932, 534: "seit die Stelle des Proklos bekannt ist, steht fest, wie Rohde gleich bemerkte, daß Empedotimos eine von Herakleides erfundene Figur ist, der einen Mythos in Nachahmung des platonischen dichtete." Capelle 1917 is, to my knowledge, the only modern work where the historicity of the main character is assumed.

²⁴Bidez 1945, 55–6 (arguing the name is invented by Heraclides as a 'pseudonym of Empedocles'); Burkert 1972, 366 n.89, Bolton 1962, 152; Bremmer 1983, 49; cf. Gottschalk 1980, 111 and n. 79.

²⁵A form of this name is attested in the Hippocratic corpus (*Epid.* 2, 5, 106, 3, cf. *Index Hipp.* and Littré's note *ad loc.*). *LGNP* III.A 142 has two records for the name Ἐμπεδοτίμος independent of Heraclides: (1) *SEG* xxxvi 384, dated to *saec.* I B.C./I A.D. (by *LGNP*), inscriptions on the *stelai* in the Museum of Tegea, published in Dubois 1983 (the names in the vocative of Empedotimus, Onasiphoron, Epaphroditos, Damatris, Markos and Nikêphoros); (2) *CEG* II 833, inscription on the marble base of the statue of Heracles and Nemean lion, dedicated in Olympia by Hippotiôn of Tarentum, son of Empedotimus; the dates *saec.* V ex./IV in. (confirmed epigraphically by the sculptor's name, Nikodamas) and Italian provenance are of particular interest. (See Fraser & Matthews, 1997, s.v.)

²⁶Notably, Capelle 1917, 42, n.2 uses all the same fragments to argue that Empedotimus is a historical figure incorporated by Heraclides into his dialogue.

²⁷cf. 21A–F.

idea of *anarmoi onkoi* which he might have found in Heraclides.²⁸ It is likely that Cicero draws on Heraclidean material in the *Dream of Scipio*.²⁹ Posidonius, who is probably familiar with several works by Heraclides,³⁰ is said to have “athetized” the story of Empedotimus (54B). Psellus’ report about this is extremely short, and the exact target of Posidonius’ criticism is not clear: it can be (especially by contrast with Iamblichus’ approval) the fanciful tale itself, or perhaps some details of the cosmological picture with which Posidonius disagrees, or both.³¹ In any case, it seems clear that he takes either the whole story or a certain part of it (specified further by the lost context) to be a literary fiction.

Other sources which mention the name of Empedotimus include Clement (55), Iamblichus *ap. Psellus* (54B); Proclus *On Plato’s Republic* (54A, 56); Damascius *On Plato’s Phaedo* (58); Damascius quoted by Philoponus in his commentary on Aristotle’s *Meteorology* (52 and Gottschalk 1980, 149–54). It is hard to tell whether any of these authors had direct access to Heraclides’ work.³²

Bolton has argued, on the basis of circumstantial evidence, that Clement’s passage which lists the pagans who had the power of foreknowledge (55) ultimately goes back to Heraclides. The excerptor or the compiler of this list appears to be taking all the literary figures as historical, but this may be dictated by his goals rather than the tradition with which he works.³³

Iamblichus, Julian, and their Christian opponents present Empedotimus as a historical character (the “neo-pagans” as a true case, the Cappadocians as a charlatan). Iamblichus’ enthusiastic acceptance of the story is understandable in the light of his interest in theurgy, since

²⁸ On Asclepiades 60–1, cf. Voss 65. On the possible influence of Heraclides, see Gottschalk 1980, 56; Rawson 1982, 368–9, with Vallance 1990, 7–43 (who is more sceptical).

²⁹ Cic. *De re publ.* 6 16,2, cf. Zetzel *ad loc.*

³⁰ cf. EK F18.39; F49.148, 234; F110.9ff.

³¹ In F49.148 EK among other periplus-stories he rejects as ἀμάγνητα, Posidonius mentions a story by Heraclides, in which the latter is said to have “created in a dialogue a certain magus arriving at Gelon’s, saying that he has sailed [around the world]” (139). We know that Posidonius had his own physical theory of the Milky Way (cf. fr. 129, 130 EK, with Kidd’s commentary *ad loc.*) and so a perspective in which to put the Empedotimus myth (see sec. 2.2 below).

³² Cf. Whittaker 1997, 306.

³³ Bolton himself treats Empedotimus as a fiction (1962, 157–75).

the real existence of Empedotimus would give him a trump card in his polemic against its critics. Ironically, it seems that Christian opponents of paganism, such as Gregory, also preferred real charlatans to mere literary characters, because the former could be more impressively exposed in their folly and thus indirectly testify to the Christian cause. On the other hand, the fact that Empedotimus is spoken of as the author of his own story indicates that Empedotimus is given a narrator’s part in Heraclides’ dialogue.³⁴ It seems useful to expand Wehrli’s citation of the *Suda* in 53 to include the line about Iamblichus, because it may shed some light on the source of this fragment. The sentence may also suggest that Iamblichus was familiar with Heraclides’ dialogue, or at least its plot.³⁵

Proclus’ agenda in his *Republic* commentary (defence of Plato’s myth of Er against the criticisms of Colotes) also makes Empedotimus’ historicity highly desirable. Proclus’ text suggests that Empedotimus’ vision was told in the first person—and Proclus knew that Heraclides was the author.³⁶ Damascius has not recorded any views concerning the dramatic framework of the story, being more interested in some of its ideas; but he also refers to this work as “the account of Empedotimus” (ὁ Ἐμπεδοτίμου λόγος),³⁷ thus also suggesting a first-person account.

1.4 The Plot

The dramatic setting of the dialogue is described by Proclus who tells us that Empedotimus was part of a hunting group. Around noon³⁸

³⁴ *Suda*’s οὗτος ἔγραψε περὶ φυσικῆς ἀκροάσεως (whatever confusion it reflects otherwise) may be based on this description.

³⁵ As is not clear from Stobaeus’ excerpt from his *On Soul* (50). This would also lend a stronger sense to the ἐξαίρει of 54B, and in any case raise a question of Iamblichus’ access to the dialogue.

³⁶ The wording in Proclus (ὁ κατὰ τὸν Ἐμπεδοτίμου λόγος ὃν Ἡρακλείδης ἱστόρησεν ὁ Ποντικὸς) may suggest that Heraclides recorded the story of Empedotimus, the real person. Cf. Wilamowitz 1932, 534, cited in n.23 above. Proclus’ source may be relatively early: most likely, Porphyry going back to Numenius (see 2.1 below); we do not know whether he himself read Heraclides.

³⁷ 58, cf. *ap. Philop. In Meteor.* 117, 9–11: καλῶς ὁ Δαμάσκιος τὴν Ἐμπεδοτίμου περὶ τοῦ γάλακτος [ὑπόθεσιν] οἰκιοῦται.

³⁸ On the mythological and literary significance of the mid-day, cf. Maass 1895, 224, n.35; Reiche 1993, 166; Bremmer 1983, 132.

he fell behind the group and had a vision of Pluto and Persephone who appeared to him in a halo of light.³⁹ Through this light, or “by means of it,”⁴⁰ he saw “the whole truth about the soul in direct visions (αὐτόπτοις θεάμασιν).” As Reiche points out citing as a parallel *Phaedr.* 246C–247C, on Plato’s view, the spectacles would include the Forms, but for Heraclides they will contain a cosmological and eschatological picture of the soul’s journey in Hades.⁴¹ Other sources tell us of three gates and three roads to heaven (57), mention three heavenly realms (58), and the Milky Way, which is identified as a path of souls in the afterlife (52, 50).

It is hard to say how much of the content of the dialogue is covered by the fragments: it is usually assumed that the missing parts were devoted to the elaboration of the doctrine of the light-like nature of soul.⁴²

Radermacher suggested that an episode with Hecate in Lucian’s *The Lovers of Lies* 22–4 might be a parody of Heraclides’ dialogue,⁴³ and conjectured on this basis that Empedotimus’ story contained a part about the underworld proper.⁴⁴ Lucian’s dialogue mocks the superstition and a related genre of storytelling, making the participants of the conversation compete in telling the most incredible ghost stories that involve someone they know. One of the stories shows some affinities with the Empedotimus myth: a man goes out hunting with his son;

³⁹ Wilamowitz, 534: “dem schlafenden Jäger”; Reiche 1993 argues that he is awake. On the eschatological significance of meeting Persephone, Bremmer 2002, 21–2.

⁴⁰ Festugière *ad loc.*

⁴¹ Reiche 1993, 163; 165–6.

⁴² Cf. Gottschalk 1980, 102.

⁴³ Radermacher 1902, 202–5, cf. Wehrli *ad* 92.

⁴⁴ About Empedotimus he says: “Aber er hat sicherlich noch mehr [viz. than extant fragments tell us] geschaut; sonst könnte Proclus sich nicht auf die Geschichte berufen, um zu beweisen, dass Menschen von den Dingen im ‘Hades’ Kenntniss zu erlangen imstande seien. Darunter kann unmöglich die Milchstrasse, wenigstens nicht die Milchstrasse allein, verstanden werden. Also wird man die beiden Berichte als Umbiegungen einer und derselben Anekdote fassen dürfen. Sie sind durchaus charakteristisch für die Art, mit der man solche Schauergeschichten im Altertum weitergetragen hat. Der eigentliche Kern der Sache bleibt ohne viel Veränderung; dagegen werden einzelne Züge nach Belieben ausgestaltet. Was vor allem wechseln muss, sind die beteiligten Personen; denn auf ihnen beruht die Glaubwürdigkeit der ganzen Darstellung. Darum ist es besonders beliebt, einen bekannten Gewährsmann zu nennen, falls man nicht gerade selber der Augenzeuge gewesen sein will” (Radermacher 1902, 203).

falling behind the group in the forest he runs into Hecate, who is holding a torch and leads him to the underworld where he gets to see all the unspeakable sights. The case of Empedotimus is only a part of a more general argument in which Radermacher seeks to establish the antecedents of the plots to several of Lucian’s dialogues in the earlier literary or mythological tradition, by tracking some core elements of the narrative which remain unchanged in the process of literary borrowing. He bases his argument on a number of verbal and structural parallels between the two stories, but the parallels are not striking.⁴⁵ Even assuming that Radermacher is right, it is not clear whether Lucian’s text can help to reconstruct Heraclides’ story: the ‘heavenly’ part is absent in Lucian’s account and we cannot be sure of the precise scope of the intended parody.

If Clement’s report which credits Empedotimus with a power of foreknowledge is accurate, one might imagine that the lost parts contained some related episode in which it would be displayed, in a way similar to the prophecy given to Scipio by Scipio the Elder in Cicero’s *Dream* 10–12, or even some of Lucian’s maverick prophets.⁴⁶

Proclus (56) contrasts Empedotimus’ vision with the vision of Cleonymus of Athens, a character of the dialogue by the Peripatetic Clearchus of Soli (fr. 8 Wehrli). Cleonymus’ vision is “cataleptic,” i.e. taking place when he is in a state “between life and death”: Proclus describes it as a mental process which takes place “without a body,” whereas Empedotimus’ vision does not transcend the category of embodied sensible experience.⁴⁷

⁴⁵ The description of Hecate and Hades may be intended as a parody, but it is hard to say whether its target is the specific plot of the Empedotimus myth rather than a certain literary genre; details involved suggest the latter (190, 4–6: ἡ Ἐκάτη δὲ πατάξασα τῷ δρακοντείῳ ποδὶ τοῦδαφος ἐποίησεν χάσμα παμμέγεθες, ἠλίκων Ταρτάρειον τὸ βάθος· εἶτα ἤχετο μετ’ ὀλίγον ἀλομένη ἐς αὐτό. ἐγὼ δὲ θαρρήσας ἐπέκοψα λαβόμενος δένδρου τινὸς πλησίον πεφυκτός, ὡς σκοτοδινιάσας ἐμπέσοιμι ἐπὶ κεφαλῇν. εἶτα ἔωρον τὰ ἐν Αἴδου ἅπαντα, τὸν Πυριφλεγέθοντα, τὴν λίμνην, τὸν Κέρβερον, τοὺς νέμους, ὥστε γνωρίζειν ἐνίους αὐτῶν).

⁴⁶ Cicero *De rep.* 6.10.12. For the argument (based on circumstantial evidence) that the Clement passage ultimately goes back to Heraclides, see Bolton 1962, 157. Voss (60), followed by Bolton (152), suggests on the basis of the *Suda* (53) that Pythagoras might be Empedotimus’ interlocutor in this dialogue, but Julian’s reference may be to a later source.

⁴⁷ 56, cf. Bolton 1962, 153. Reiche’s translation of the penultimate sentence of this fragment as referring only to the disembodied kind of experience seems to me to

The case of Cleonymus is interesting also because in Clearchus' dialogue the place of punishment seems to be not the traditional underworld, but some location in the heavens.⁴⁸ Bolton suggests that this may be a Heraclidean influence, since in Empedotimus' story the two chthonic deities appear in heaven. Thus Heraclides is thought to have adopted the concept of "heavenly Hades," which would include a place of punishment.⁴⁹ This might reflect a contemporary tendency to treat Hades, the deity of the underworld, as equal in rank to the Olympian gods, witnessed also by Plato, who in *Laws* 7 introduces a month sacred to Pluto and the chthonic gods.⁵⁰ A direct link between Plato's calendric reform and Heraclides' fragment is hard to attest on the basis of the meager textual evidence that we have,⁵¹ but the reason

overstate the distinction drawn by Proclus between the two cases (which is clear from the end of this chapter, where Proclus says that "Empedotimuses and Cleonymuses are rare").

⁴⁸Wehrli, *Clearchus*, fr. 8, 15–23; Bolton 1962, 152–3: τὴν μὲν οὖν αὐτοῦ ψυχὴν φάναι παρὰ τὸν θάνατον οἶον ἐκ δεσμών δόξαι τινῶν ἀφαιμένην τοῦ σώματος παρεθέντος μετέωρον ἀρθῆναι, καὶ ἀρθείσαν ὑπὲρ γῆς ἰδεῖν τόπους ἐν αὐτῇ παντοδαπούς καὶ τοῖς σχήμασι καὶ τοῖς χρώμασιν καὶ ῥεύματα ποταμῶν ἀπρόσοπτα ἀνθρώποις· καὶ τέλος ἀφικέσθαι εἰς τινα χώρον ἱερὸν τῆς Ἑστίας, ὃν περιέπειν δαιμονίας δυνάμεις ἐν γυναικῶν μορφαῖς ἀπεριγῆτοις. εἰς δὲ ἐκείνον αὐτὸν τὸν τόπον καὶ ἄλλον ἀφικέσθαι ἀνθρωπῶν καὶ ἀμφοῖν τὴν αὐτὴν γενέσθαι φωνήν, μένειν τε ἡσυχῇ καὶ ὄραν τὰ ἐκεῖ πάντα. καὶ δὴ καὶ ὄραν ἄμφω ψυχῶν ἐκεῖ κολάσεις τε καὶ κρίσεις καὶ τὰς αἰεὶ καθαιρομένας καὶ τὰς τούτων ἐπισκόπους Εὐμενίδας (12, 9–17 W.) "He claims that his soul after death seemed to rise up, as though released from some ties, with the body beside it, and having risen above the earth to see on it places varying in shapes and colours, and the streams of rivers that humans cannot look at; and at the end arrived into some holy region of the hearth, which was tended to by divine powers bound with female forms. And to that place he arrived and also another man, and to both of them there was the same voice, [telling them] to stay there in silence and observe all things there. And both of them saw the chastisements and judgements of the souls that take place there, and the souls being eternally purified and the Eumenides watching over them."

⁴⁹This would rule out the supplement of a traditional Hades as suggested by Rademacher. Gottschalk 1980, 101, thinks that Empedotimus' Hades could be located between the moon and the earth.

⁵⁰*Laws* 7, 828C6–D2; Morrow 1960, 451–3; Reiche 1993, 164–5. For literary parallels of milder representation of the god of death, see Wüst 999.

⁵¹A direct link is argued by Reiche 1993, who also suggests that this presence should be explained only by Pluto's tutelage over the summer month; but on the other hand, 58 suggests at least one other reason for Pluto's appearance, namely his permanent (non-calendric) tutelage over the heavenly Hades, i.e. everything below the sphere of the sun.

Plato gives in the *Laws* of why "warlike men" should not shun this god but honor him instead — namely that "he is the best for the human race since there is no way in which (*οὐκ ἐστὶν ἡεῖ*) the communion is better for soul and body than their dissolution" (828D2–3) — might be relevant to the rationale behind the mythological setting of Heraclides' dialogue as a treatise on the soul.⁵²

2. Empedotimus' Vision

2.1 Cosmic Topography

Varro quoted in 'Servius auctus' mentions the "three gates and three roads" as parts of Empedotimus' vision. They are situated "towards the sign of Scorpio, ... at the limit which is between Leo and Cancer, and between Aquarius and Pisces" (57). Servius' quotation comes from his commentary on *Georgics* 1.32–5, where Virgil, addressing August as the thirteenth god, mentions the sign of Scorpio as allowing space for a new deity.⁵³ The details about the other two gates of Empedotimus' myth are omitted by Servius, even if Varro had them (possibly because Scorpio is the focus of the commentary), and no obvious interpretation of these locations is found in other ancient sources.

Varro's fragment is tentatively assigned by scholars to his Menippean satire called *At the Cross-Roads before the Three Gates* or *On Acquiring Virtue*.⁵⁴ The satire has to do with questions of nurture vs. nature, moral education, and possibly the role and form of religious beliefs.⁵⁵ Varro scholars, interpreting Heraclides' fragment, conclude that the three roads have to do with moral choice of some sort. This

⁵²On the role of developing astronomy and geography in "secularization" of traditional sacred resting places of virtuous souls, such as the underworld and the Isles of Blessed, see Burkert 1972, 363 n.70.

⁵³*anne nouum tardis sidus te mensibus addas./ qua locus Erigonen inter chelasque sequentis/panditur — ipse tibi iam brachia contrahit ardens/Scorpios et caeli iusta plus parte relinquit.*

⁵⁴Τριδοίτης τριτύλιος (Περὶ ἀρετῆς κτήσεως). The first attribution seems to have been made by Riese (cf. Wilamowitz 534: "wegen dieses Titels"). Maass 1895, 225, suggested that Varro imitated Heraclides' dialogue (224, and n. 25), but the other fragments of the satire do not seem to be related to the plot of Heraclides' dialogue. Wehrli is sceptical. In the recent editions the fragment is printed with *Trioditēs*, but scholars are aware that it may come from elsewhere (see Cèbe 1997; Krenkel 2002; cf. Lehmann 1997).

⁵⁵Frr. 257–61 Astbury; Cèbe 1997, 2067–70.

interpretation suggests itself in the light of the known descriptions of soul's afterlife in the literary sources.⁵⁶ More specific links between the fragment and the main ideas of the satire were conjectured, but no agreement has been reached.⁵⁷ The problem is that too little of the plot of the satire can be deduced from the fragments. Generally, for the interpretation of Heraclides' — as opposed to Varro's — fragment, the context of Servius' commentary seems to be more relevant.

Rohde, followed by a number of scholars,⁵⁸ interpreted the roads and gates on the basis of chapter 7 of Plutarch's *On "Live Unknown."* In this treatise, devoted to the criticism of the Epicurean motto (λάθε βιώσας), Plutarch invokes a definition of soul as light, whose source is generally believed to be Heraclides (1130B = 48),⁵⁹ and then goes on to describe the afterlife, emphasising the pastimes of the virtuous in recovering the memories of their past deeds⁶⁰ and citing Pindar's now lost *thrēnos* (1130CE).⁶¹ On this reading, the three roads lead to the three different places of retribution, of which only two are mentioned

⁵⁶ Cf. Cumont 1949, 279 n.5, who cites *Gorg.* 524A, Proclus *In Remp.* 1.85, 2.132 Kroll; Damascius *In Phaed.* 192, 11 Norvin.

⁵⁷ Cèbe 1997, 2067 n.9, cf. Krenkel.

⁵⁸ Rohde 1893, II, ch. XII, n.62; Voss, 58; cf. Bignone 1936, 599; more recently, Gottschalk 1980, 99–100.

⁵⁹ Wehrli follows Rohde, Bignone and Voss. For discussion see 3.1 below.

⁶⁰ And perhaps de-emphasising the moment of oblivion provided by the Letheian water. Plutarch's argument here does depend on the goal of his polemic. For the opposite line of argument, cf. *De sera numinis vindicta*, 565A9–566A10.

⁶¹ Fr. 114 a–c Bowra. Rohde takes the third (omitted) state to be the neutral state (like that of Homeric εἰδωλα καμόντων) and cites as further parallels of a triple division Lucian *Luct.* 7–9 (where ἀγαθοὶ τῶν ἀνδρῶν καὶ δίκαιοι καὶ κατ' ἀρετὴν βεβιωκότες are sent to the Elysian meadow; the πονηροὶ are given to the Erinyes, οἱ δὲ τοῦ μέσου βίου, πολλοὶ ὄντες οὗτοι ἐν τῷ λεμῶνι πλανῶνται ἀνευ τῶν σωμάτων σκαὶ γινόμενοι καὶ ὑπὸ τῆ ἀφῆ καθάπερ ἀφανιζόμενοι [MacLeod] and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. Rom.*: καὶ εἰ τις ἄρα τὰς ἀνθρωπίνους ψυχὰς ἀολυθείσας τοῦ σώματος ὑποδέχεται τόπος, οὗ ὡς ὁ καταχθόνιος καὶ ἀφεγγής ὑποδέχεται τὴν ἐμὴν, ἐν ᾧ φασι τοὺς κακοδαίμονας οἰκεῖν, οὐδὲ τὸ λεγόμενον τῆς Ἀθήνης πέδιον, ἀλλ' ὁ μετέωρος καὶ καθαρός αἰθήρ, ἐν ᾧ τοὺς ἐκ θεῶν φύντας οἰκεῖν λόγος εὐδαίμονα καὶ μακάριον ἔχοντας βίον (8.52.4; 204, 2–8 Jacoby). Wilamowitz 1922, 500, suggests, differently, that the trichotomy included the roads for the good, the bad, and those who joined the gods. Cumont 1949, 280 n.3 says that the *triodos* in question is made up by two roads, for the good and bad respectively (citing *Tusc.* 1.72; *Consol.* fr. 12 Mueller = Lact. *Inst.* 3.19.6).

(numbered as the second and third): the Meadow of the Blessed and hell proper. The difficulty with this view is that Plutarch is supposed to be using Pindar's text to elucidate Heraclides' cosmological picture, no single known detail of which is mentioned in his explanation, the only link with Heraclides being the alleged provenance of the thesis of "soul-light" and the supporting argument.⁶²

Damascius in his commentary on the *Phaedo* 110B5–111D2 (= 58), mentions the "three realms" as a part of Heraclides' picture of the cosmos. Heraclides' division of the cosmos is cited after the tripartite division of the earth by the sons of Cronos in Homer *Il.* 15, 189–93. In Homer, Poseidon gets the sea, Zeus the heavens and Pluto the underworld, the earth being common to all.⁶³ Heraclides' exegetical innovation (and the reason why he is quoted separately along with the traditional Homeric division) consists in assigning each sphere an astronomical rather than a traditional "elemental" cosmological location: Zeus rules over the sphere of fixed stars, Poseidon over the planets as far as the sun,⁶⁴ while Pluto is given everything under the sun.⁶⁵

⁶² On which see 3.1 below. Wehrli, although accepting the "light-knowledge" fragment as Heraclidean, in his comment ad 95 (= 58) denies that Plutarch's adjacent exegesis derives from Heraclides; cf. also Moraux 1963, 1195.

⁶³ (Poseidon speaks:)

Τρεῖς γὰρ τ' ἐκ Κρόνου εἰμὲν ἀδελφοί, οὓς τέκετο 'Ρέα. ||
 Ζεὺς καὶ ἐγώ, τρίτατος δ' Αἴδης, ἐνέρουσιν ἀνάσσω. ||
 Τριχθὰ δὲ πάντα δεδάσται, ἕκαστος δ' ἔμμορε τιμῆς ||
 ἦτοι ἐγὼν ἔλαχον πολὴν ἄλα ναίεμεν αἰεὶ ||
 παλλομενῶν, Αἴδης δ' ἔλαχε ζόφον ἠεροέντα, ||
 Ζεὺς δ' ἔλαχ' οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἐν αἰθέρι καὶ νεφέλῃσιν ||
 Γαῖα δ' ἔτι ξυνή πάντων καὶ μακρὸς Ὀλυμπος.

The same Homeric passage is cited also by Plato in the *Gorgias* (523A3–5) in an eschatological context, as a point of departure in the story of Pluto's judicial reform in the underworld. Like Plato, Heraclides uses the passage as a point of departure for his own interpretation (astronomical mapping of the three realms, setting the stage for his dramatic plot).

⁶⁴ We can guess that Heraclides (like Plato in *Tim.* 38C–D) adopted the "Egyptian" order of planets, in which the sun was the second closest to the earth, so that Poseidon is given all the planets except the moon, and the lower area which comprises the moon and the Milky Way is assigned to Hades.

⁶⁵ Not the moon, as in the later demarcations of the lowest stratum of the cosmos, which included the world of coming-to-be and perishing. Although the world of generation is not explicitly excluded, it is clear that it is not among the focal points of this division.

Whether the earth as a common territory is excluded from the division is not entirely clear from the fragment.⁶⁶

Burkert has drawn attention to the fact that according to Macrobius' commentary *On the Dream of Scipio* 1.12.4, the road towards incarnation passes through Cancer to Leo, with the sun moving downwards.⁶⁷ On this basis, he has explained the location of the gate between these two signs.⁶⁸ This is perhaps the only other reference to the function of a passage between Cancer and Leo in the ancient sources. On Burkert's interpretation, the three kinds of souls that travel along the three routes are those of the good (who are bound for Heracles' gate to Zeus), the bad (presumably going to Pluto), and those travelling back towards incarnation (through the gate from Cancer to Leo). The reference in Macrobius is ultimately derived from Numenius,⁶⁹ through Porphyry's commentaries on Plato.⁷⁰ Burkert's suggestion is that this interpretation of the gate between Cancer and Leo (and much else) goes back to the ancient Pythagorean tradition, to which Heraclides' story is also a witness.

I think there are reasons to believe that Numenius and Porphyry may be dependent on later sources. The same tradition going back to Numenius attributes to Pythagoras the interpretation of the Milky Way as an abode of souls very similar to the one we find in Heraclides. The attribution is found in Porphyry *On the Cave of the Nymphs* 28, Macrobius *On the Dream of Scipio* 1.12.3 (= fr. 34 des Places), and Proclus *On Plato's Republic* 128,1–7 Kroll (= fr. 35 des Places). Macrobius

⁶⁶ This is important for the location of Hades. For Radermacher's argument, see p. 100 above; cf. Wilamowitz 1932, 535.

⁶⁷ Burkert 1972, 367, n.91.

⁶⁸ *ergo descensurae cum adhuc in Cancro sunt, quoniam illic positae necdum lacteum reliquerunt, adhuc in numero sunt deorum. cum uero ad Leonem labendo peruenerint, illic condicionis futurae auspicantur exordium. et quia in Leone sunt rudimenta nascendi et quaedam humanae naturae tirocinia, Aquarius autem aduersus Leoni est et illo oriente mox occidit, ideo, cum sol Aquarium teneat, Manibus parentatur; utpote in signo quod humanae uitae contrarium uel aduersum feratur.* Presumably the descent starts with souls still forming a part of the Milky Way, but when the souls are sliding towards Leo, they are already partly detached from their heavenly abode. Otherwise there would be a difficulty understanding the spatial orientation of the "gate," cf. Armisen-Marchetti 2001, *ad loc.*

⁶⁹ This text is included by des Places in his fr. 34; for a detailed argument with Quellenforschung and bibliography, see de Ley 1972.

⁷⁰ Cf. de Ley 1972, 22–3; Armisen-Marchetti 2001, n.275.

describes the realm of Pluto as beginning at the level of the Milky Way⁷¹ which is apparently located above the seven planetary spheres and not beneath the sun as in Heraclides.⁷² Proclus, on the other hand, reports that Numenius (not Pythagoras) uses the Homeric epithet "the folk of the dreams" (*dēmos oneirōn*, *Od.* 24.12) to refer to the Milky Way and that it is according to Numenius that Pythagoras in his secret language calls the Milky Way "Hades" and "the place of souls". This might suggest that Numenius may have supplied the interpretation of Hades as the Milky Way himself rather than finding it in his Pythagorean source, whatever that was. Earlier tradition going back to Aristotle does not mention this interpretation of the Milky Way among the others that it attributes to Pythagoreans.⁷³ In fact, Wilamowitz suggested that Heraclides is Numenius' source for the new construction of the cosmos in general and for the attribution of this view of the Milky Way to Pythagoras in particular.⁷⁴

Needless to say, the attribution of this material to Pythagoras by Numenius and later tradition should be treated with caution.⁷⁵ As was already mentioned, the Empedotimus story retold by Proclus is probably coming from Porphyry,⁷⁶ who may depend on Numenius. So, Burkert's parallel is valid to the extent that there is a common tradition, and Heraclides plays a certain role in it. What role exactly, whether that of a conscientious exponent of ancient Pythagorean doctrines, artistically inspired witness to the same doctrines, or just a parallel source used by later Neoplatonic authors along with other Pythagorean sources, we cannot say with assurance. Most probably it is some combination of

⁷¹ *hinc et Pythagoras putat a lacteo circulo deorsum incipere Ditis imperium, quia animae inde lapsae videntur iam a superis recessisse.*

⁷² *In Somn. Scip.* 1.12.13.

⁷³ See below 2.2.1.

⁷⁴ Wilamowitz 1932, 535. His opinion that *De antr. nymph.* 28 is the source of Proclus *In Remp.* was corrected by more recent scholarship, but his remark: "den Neoplatonikern zu glauben und Herakleides von älteren Pythagoreern abhängen zu lassen ist dieselbe antihistorische Methode, die den Platon bei Orpheus oder älteren Orphikern borgen läßt" may still be valid. Of course, it is possible that Heraclides himself attributed this view to Pythagoreans; there clearly is room for more research. Cf. Diels 1879b, 489.

⁷⁵ On his tendency to "Pythagoreanise" Platonic tradition, see Frede 1987, 1044–50; O'Meara 1990, 9–14. Porphyry occasionally calls him a Pythagorean; cf. Euseb. *H.E.* 6.19,8 and Stob. *Ecl.* 2.14,17 W.

⁷⁶ See above (p. 106 and nn. 69, 70).

the three. In any case, we have here evidence that some eschatological motifs found in Heraclides' myth are adapted and developed in a tentatious way by the nascent Platonic-Neopythagorean tradition from the second century C.E. onwards.⁷⁷ The recurrence of the "gates" in this tradition is probably dependent on this adaptation, and cannot tell us much about Heraclides' source.⁷⁸

2.2 Milky Way and Soul-vehicles: Evidence in Damascius and Iamblichus

2.2.1 Damascius

While Alexander and Olympiodorus make no mention of this myth in their commentaries on *Meteorology*, Philoponus discusses it at some length.⁷⁹ His source is Damascius⁸⁰ who approved of the view of the Milky Way as located in the heavenly (not sublunary) realm and upheld it against Aristotle's theory. According to Aristotle, the Milky Way is formed as a result of dry exhalation being heated by the motion of heavenly bodies; the mechanism is similar to the one Aristotle uses to explain comets.⁸¹ In support of his explanation Aristotle cites the fact that the brightest stars are located in the area of the Milky Way.

⁷⁷ This has to do particularly with the astronomical interpretation of the "heavenly Hades." Generally, the theme of astronomical boundaries between the realms of different aspects of divinity has a prominent place in Neoplatonic theology, and is elaborated with multiple variations by many later writers. (Cf. Proclus *In Tim.* 1.272, 17–25, *Theol.* 6.6–10 (the tripartition of the cosmos into the sphere of fixed stars [Zeus], planets [Poseidon] and the rest, including the earth, is found in 6.10, 46.8–14 Saffrey–Westerink); *Crat.* 83.10–84.5; *Olymp. In Gorg.* 245.16–246.6 [different division of things within the cosmos into heavenly, earthly, and intermediate]; Damascius *In Phaed.* 1.470, 483, 497, 523).

⁷⁸ If we assume a Heraclidean origin of the "three gates" in heaven, the question of its source still remains. Reiche examines several possibilities and suggests an explanation based on the facts about the visible sky which can be accessible to the naked eye of a star-watcher: namely, that the gates between Leo and Cancer and Aquarius and Pisces, respectively, correspond to the visible "gaps" in the continuous pattern of the zodiac with constellations overlapping and "flowing" into each other (Reiche 1993, 171).

⁷⁹ The passages are printed and discussed by Gottschalk 1980, 149–54.

⁸⁰ Westerink 1977, 12, suggests the discussion comes from Damascius' commentary on *Meteorology*.

⁸¹ *Meteor.* 1.8, 345b32–346b7, see Gilbert 1907, 658–61. Heraclides' own explanation of comets as reported in 'Aëtius' 3.2.5 (both in [Plutarch] and Stobaeus) is different from Aristotle's, although it is described as similar to that given by all the Peripatetics.

Both Damascius and Philoponus are inclined to place the Milky Way higher up, in the region of fixed stars.⁸²

Damascius argues that the Milky Way neither has exhalation as its matter nor is formed in the sublunary realm.⁸³ He cites approvingly the story of Empedotimus, which he calls a "fact" and not a "tale." It is not clear whether he had any access to Heraclides' text: as we have seen, the plot of the dialogue was known to the late Platonists, including Proclus. Here are some doctrinal points which Damascius establishes as germane to the description of heaven in the Empedotimus story:

- (i) The Milky Way is the road of the souls going through the Hades in the heavens.⁸⁴
- (ii) In their progress the souls get cleansed.⁸⁵
- (iii) The heavenly circle is a divine structure (explanation of the myth of Hera's milk: no soul will ascend until it draws in some of Hera's milk).
- (iv) The Milky Way is a certain disposition of the heaven, imperishable, starry, and owes its milky appearance to the density of small stars.⁸⁶

⁸² In fact, the view according to which the Milky Way is located on the fixed sphere is attributed to Theophrastus in Macrobius' *In Somm. Scip.* 1.15.4 (= fr. 116 FHS&G, with the parallels in Philo *Prov.* 2.89, Achill. *Isag.* 24 (55,17–8 Maass), Manilius, *Astron.* 1.723–8). On the significance of the issue in the tradition, see Mansfeld 2005, 53–4, n.110.

⁸³ Philoponus, *In Meteor.*, 116, 36–117, 8. Philoponus cites two objections made by Damascius (which he himself takes over in his critique of Aristotle's arguments): (i) none of the effects formed in the exhalation can hold for a very long time without change, but the Milky Way does not undergo any visible changes at all; (ii) if the Milky Way is formed in the aether, and aether in its motion lags behind the circular motion of heavenly bodies (the point made by Aristotle himself in his discussion of comets), then the Milky Way should be lagging behind the fixed stars as well; but this does not happen.

⁸⁴ 117, 11–2 Hayduck: φησὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖνος (sc. Ἐμπεδοτύμος) ὁδὸν εἶναι ψυχῶν τὸ γάλα τῶν Ἄιδην τὸν ἐν οὐρανῷ διαπορευομένων.

⁸⁵ 117, 12–1: καὶ οὐ θαυμαστόν, φησὶν ὁ Δαμάσκιος, εἰ καὶ ψυχαὶ καθαίρονται ἐν τούτῳ τῷ κύκλῳ τῆς γενέσεως. The addition of <διὰ> after κύκλῳ, suggested by Hayduck, is not necessary, cf. Philop. *In GC* 248, 6; 313, 13, also 298, 16 (the image seems to be standard).

⁸⁶ 117, 19–21 (= 118, 9–10): εἶναι δ' οὖν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τινα διάθεσιν ἄφθαρτον, ἀστρώων, μικρῶν ἀστέρων πυκνότητι γαλακτίζουσαν.

(i) indicates that the state of souls in the Milky Way is transitory. Damascius holds that the Milky Way is a permanent astronomical phenomenon: whatever transformations the souls might undergo, they should not interfere with this status of the "Milk." (ii) says that it has the function of purgatory. Gottschalk points out that this may come not from the Empedotimus story, but from a Neoplatonic theory of soul's descent, although as we have seen in the Cleonymus story, the idea of heavenly purgatory had some currency in Heraclides' time.⁸⁷ (iii) The myth of Hera's milk also occurs in the "Pythagorean" version of the myth reported by Numenius, although the function of milk seems to be presented differently by Damascius.⁸⁸ This seems to be Damascius' elaboration of some Platonist readings of Heraclides, although the view of heaven as a divine arrangement is certainly supported by Heraclides' fragments.

Damascius' definition of the Milky Way (iv) displays a number of affinities with the definition attributed to Democritus by the doxographical tradition:

Δημόκριτος πολλῶν καὶ μικρῶν καὶ συνεχῶν ἀστέρων
συμφωτιζομένων ἀλλήλοις συναυγασμὸν διὰ τὴν πύκνωσιν.

Democritus [holds that the Milky Way is] a meeting of rays because of the density of many small continuous stars that give light together ([Plut.] *Epir.* III 1 893A4–6 (cf. Stob. *Ecl.* 1.27 1) = 'Aët.' 3.1.6).⁸⁹

⁸⁷ See Clearchus fr. 8 W. above p. 102 and n. 48.

⁸⁸ Damascius, *ap. Philop. In Meteor.* 117, 14–9. Numenius seems to be saying that the souls are enticed into the descent by milk and honey: δῆμος δ' ὀνειρώων κατὰ Πυθαγόραν αἱ ψυχαί, ἅς συνάγεσθαι φησὶν εἰς τὸν γαλαξίαν τὸν οὕτω προσαγορευόμενον ἀπὸ τῶν γάλακτι τρεφομένων, ὅταν εἰς γένεσιν πέσωσιν· ὃ καὶ σπένδειν αὐταῖς τοὺς ψυχαγωγούς μέλι κεκραμένον γάλακτι ὡς ἂν δι' ἡδονῆς εἰς γένεσιν μεμελετηκῆναις ἔρχεσθαι. (Porphyry, *De antro nymph.* 28 (= fr. 32 des Places), cf. Proclus, *In Remp.* 128 Kroll (= fr. 35 des Places), Macrobius, *In Somn. Scip.* 1.12.3 (= fr. 34 des Places). In all three fragments milk is taken to be a milder and more agreeable kind of corporeal nourishment used to attract the soul naturally averse to generation. Damascius also refers to generation, but takes it to be "the generation in the heaven" (n. 84 above). The role of milk, on Damascius' view, consists in cleansing the souls which are about to ascend (διὸ καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἀναγωγὴν τῶν ψυχῶν οἰκείως ἔχειν, καὶ τοῦτο εἶναι τὸ μυθευόμενον, ὡς οὐκ ἄνευσιν ἀπὸ τοῦ κόσμου ψυχῆ μὴ σπῶσα τοῦ Ἥραίου γάλακτος, ὃ ἐστὶν εἰ μὴ τυχῆ τῆς ἐν τῷ γάλακτι τοῦτ' κεχυμένης προνοίας αὐτῆς τοῦ θεοῦ).

⁸⁹ The source is Aristotle *Meteor.* 1.8, who attributes this view also to Anaxagoras,

Unlike Numenius, Damascius gives a physicalist interpretation of the animate constituents of the Milky Way describing them as small stars. One would like to know whether he found any of this in his source for the Empedotimus story; unfortunately, our sources do not tell us. Heraclides' view is not mentioned in the 'Aëtius' chapter on the Milky Way. The view that the Milky Way is made of souls does not occur in Aristotle's discussion of earlier views in *Meteorology* 1.8.⁹⁰ It is not found in Macrobius, who, however, notes in the beginning of his exposition that he has omitted mythological accounts.⁹¹ This view occurs in Cicero's *The Dream of Scipio* 16, whose source could be Heraclides,⁹² and it is mentioned, anonymously, by Manilius last in his list which otherwise largely coincides with that of Macrobius.⁹³ In these later sources, the "souls" view is not linked with any specific cosmological theory: it is either invoked in an explicitly mythological context, as in Cicero, or contrasted with the naturalist accounts, as in Manilius.

With regard to the precise place of the stuff of the Milky Way in the hierarchy of being, Damascius disagrees with "Empedotimus,"

and presents it differently: "Anaxagoras and Democritus hold that the Milky Way is the light of certain stars. The sun, they say, in its course beneath the earth, does not shine upon some of the stars; the light of those upon which the sun does shine is not visible to us, being obscured by its rays, while the Milky Way is the direct light of those stars which are screened from the sun's light by the earth" (345a26–32). Cf. Mansfeld 2005, 33–4.

⁹⁰ Aristotle mentions two mythological accounts: "The so-called Pythagoreans give two explanations. Some say that the Milky Way is the path taken by one of the stars at the time of the legendary fall of Phaethon: others say that it is the circle in which the sun once moved. And the region is supposed to have been scorched or affected in some other such way as a result of the passage of these bodies" (345a14–9). Both views are reproduced in 'Aet.' 3.1.2, contrasted with a third 'Pythagorean' account, naturalist but sceptical; see Mansfeld 2005, 29–44 for discussion.

⁹¹ *In Somn. Scip.* 1.15.3: *sed nos fabulosa reticentes ea tantum quae ad naturam eius visa sunt pertinere dicemus*. Macrobius does not mention the Pythagorean stories of the sun's old road and Phaethon which most probably were in his source. On the doxographies dependent on Posidonius, see Kidd 1988, 487–8.

⁹² Wilamowitz points out the possibility of Neopythagorean influence on Cicero (Wilamowitz 1932, II, 535).

⁹³ *Astron.* 1.758: *an fortes animae dignataque numina caelo // corporibus resolute suis terraeque remissa // huc migrant ex orbe suumque habitantia caelum // aetherios vivunt annos mundoque fruuntur?* On Manilius' sources, cf. Diels 1879a 229, 1879b 489. Wilamowitz cites as parallel Ovid. *Met.* 1.168 *est via sublimes, caelo manifesta sereno, lactea nomen habet, candor notabilis ipso. hac iter est superis ad magni tecta Tonantis*.

saying that it is unlikely to be the made of soul-vehicles: because its constitution is so bright and star-like, and always in the same state, it must be higher, perhaps composed of divine beings.⁹⁴

Philoponus seems to have had no direct access to the text of Heraclides: his discussion closely follows Damascius' paraphrase adding no independent information about Heraclides' theory.⁹⁵ In the course of his criticism of (iv),⁹⁶ replying to his objection on behalf of those who take the Milky Way to be constituted by souls, he corrects Damascius' presentation of their view, explaining that they do think that the souls which constitute the Milky Way are of the same stuff as heavenly bodies, and so are called "star-like" and "radiant."⁹⁷ Philoponus' source for this is not revealed. Gottschalk tentatively suggested that he might

⁹⁴ 117, 21–6: ψυχῶν δὲ ὀχήματα, φησί, λέγειν οὐκ εὐλογον τῆς συστάσεως αὐτοῦ λαμπρᾶς οὕτω καὶ ἀστροειδοῦς φαινομένης, καὶ αἰεὶ κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ καὶ ὡσαύτως ἐχούσης. διὰ τί δὲ μὴ μάλλον δαιμονίων ψυχῶν, διὰ τί δὲ μὴ πρῶτον θεῶν; ἀπὸ θεῶν γὰρ ἀρχεσθαι δεῖ καὶ ταύτην τὴν ἰδιότητα. ἄλλως τε εἰ ἐδείχθη μέρος ὧν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, πῶς οὐκ ἂν εἴη θεὸς καὶ θεῶν πλήρης, ἅτε τὸν ὀρώμενον συμπληρῶν οὐρανόν; "And it is not reasonable, he says, to call [it] the vehicles of the souls, since it is obviously so bright and star-like, and always is disposed in the same way. And why, indeed, not of the divine souls, why not gods, in the first place? For this speciality, too, must have its beginning from gods. Particularly since it has been shown to be the part of heaven, how would it fail to be god and full of gods, seeing that it fills the visible heaven?" On the basis of this criticism, Gottschalk concludes that the notion of soul-vehicle was present in Heraclides' text (Gottschalk 1980, 153), but the issue should be treated with caution, as we here have a third-hand report in the tradition where the notion of soul-vehicle has become a common technical term.

⁹⁵ Elsewhere in this commentary, using a secondary source, such as Alexander's *In Meteor.*, when he encounters Alexander's citation from Aratus, he gives his readers a fuller version (cf. Alex. 42, 2 with Philop. 112, 36–9). Olympiodorus, a later Alexandrian, does not even mention Heraclides' theory in his commentary on this chapter (although he is familiar with both Ammonius' and Alexander's treatments of the subject).

⁹⁶ 118, 7–10: καὶ αὐτὸς γοῦν τοῦ πλάσματος τῆς ἀτόπου θεολογίας αἰσθόμενος ἐπὶ φυσικὴν ἐγράπετο αἰτίαν ἀπίθανον καὶ αὐτὴν· εἶναι γὰρ φησι τὸν γαλαξίαν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τινα διάθεσιν ἄφθαρτον, ἀστρώων, μικρῶν ἀστέρων πυκνότητι γαλακτιζουσαν.

⁹⁷ 118, 14–20: τοῦτο δὲ οὐκ ἀναγκαῖον· καὶ γὰρ ὀχήματα τῶν ἡμετέρων ψυχῶν ὑποθέμενοι τὸ γάλα τῆς οὐσίας τῶν οὐρανίων αὐτὰ φασί, διόπερ ἀστροειδῆ καὶ αὐγοειδῆ ταῦτα καλοῦσιν, αἰδίως τῶν ἡμετέρων ἐξημμένα ψυχῶν συνανιόντα τε αὐταῖς καὶ συγκατιόντα. εἰ δὲ καὶ ψυχῶν ἐστί κατ' αὐτὸν δίοδος πάντως που μετὰ τῶν ἰδίων ὀχημάτων διατρεχουσῶν, οὐχ οἶδα δι' ἣντινα αἰτίαν τὴν ὁδὸν ἐκείνην τριβουσι.

have been presenting the theory of Heraclides, because in using the terms "star-like and radiant" rather than "aetherial" "he agrees with the pre-Neoplatonic doxographical tradition, and his suggestion that souls are permanently attached to their vehicles at least does not contradict it."⁹⁸ Several concerns arise with regard to this suggestion.

First, Heraclides is reported to have recognised aether, so the term "aetherial" perhaps should not be discarded right away.⁹⁹

Second, as we shall see in the next section, a certain pre-Neoplatonic Platonist tradition had a concept of fine-textured body in which soul resides when in the heavens. It is impossible to attest its origin in Heraclides; in fact, Gottschalk himself advises against assigning to Heraclides the whole of that doctrine on the strength of Iamblichus' evidence.¹⁰⁰

Third, the Neoplatonic tradition itself uses the term "radiant and star-like body" to designate the vehicle of rational soul.¹⁰¹ It is possible to suppose that in his discussion in *On Aristotle's Meteorology*, Philoponus is referring to a particular version of the theory of soul-vehicles adopted in the school of Ammonius, which is presented in detail in the proem of his commentary on Aristotle's *On the Soul*. According to this theory, there are three levels of soul-vehicles corresponding to the three parts of human soul: the "dense" body which clothes the vegetative soul, the "pneumatic" body which is a vehicle for "irrational" (animal) soul and the "star-like and radiant" body which is the vehicle of the rational soul. Each type of soul is inseparable from its corresponding body, and separable from the body of a lower level. Thus, rational soul is separable from both the "dense" and "pneumatic" bodies, but inseparable from the "radiant and star-like" body, which is of the same stuff as heavenly bodies.¹⁰² The Milky Way is

⁹⁸ Gottschalk 1980, 104.

⁹⁹ See below 3.2.

¹⁰⁰ Gottschalk 1980, 103.

¹⁰¹ See Schibli 1993 (for references and bibliography).

¹⁰² Philoponus, *In An.* 18, 22–8: διὸ φασιν μετὰ τὰ ὑπὸ γῆν δικαιοτέρα πάλιν παραγίνεσθαι αὐτὴν ἐνθάδε ἐπὶ τουσοῦτον, ἕως ἑαυτὴν καθάρασα ἀναχθῆ τῆς γενέσεως ἀπαλλαγείσα· τότε τοίνυν καὶ τὸν θυμὸν καὶ τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν ἀποτιθεσθαι μετὰ τούτου τοῦ ὀχήματος, τοῦ πνεύματος λέγω· εἶναι δὲ τι καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο ἄλλο τι αἰδίως αὐτῆς ἐξημμένον σῶμα οὐράνιον καὶ διὰ τοῦτο αἰδίον, ὃ φασιν αὐγοειδὲς ἢ ἀστροειδὲς. For the theory of vehicles in Philoponus, see van der Eijk 2005, 33–4 and nn. 183, 203; for earlier sources, Dodds 1963.

described as an abode of the rational souls, as yet another of Philoponus' texts tells us.¹⁰³ Philoponus seems to be using this theory to attack the Heraclides/Damascius view of the Milky Way as the dwelling place of souls, pointing out that the latter view fails to explain why souls thus understood have to gather in the Milky Way, since they could travel everywhere.¹⁰⁴ Philoponus closes on a sceptical note, berating Damascius for buying into a cheap myth where one ought to use the method proper to natural science, or withhold judgement if the subject transcends the scope of natural phenomena.¹⁰⁵ He does not seem inclined to relate the vehicle theory to Heraclides' theory of soul (perhaps because he does not know it).

2.2.2 Iamblichus

The only fragment to link the soul's constitution with the Milky Way comes from Iamblichus' *On Soul* preserved by Stobaeus (50). It is possible that Iamblichus draws on some unknown doxographical tradition, and it is likely that he does more than simply copy his sources.

The context of 50 is the discussion of different Platonic theories of the soul's descent. Iamblichus presents the views of three groups of Platonists on the starting point of descent and on the status of descended souls.¹⁰⁶ The first group (1), which includes Plotinus, Porphyry and Amelius, holds that (a) souls descend to bodies from the transcendent region; (b) in this descent all souls have equal status in entering the bodies. According to the second group (2), which claims affinity with Plato's view in the *Timaeus* and contrast with (1): (a) the souls descend from both transcendent and intracosmic regions, as determined by divine lots,¹⁰⁷ and (b) bodies are assigned to the

¹⁰³ *Aet.* 290, 7–9 Rabe: τινές γοῦν τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς θεολόγων καὶ τὸν γαλαξίαν καλούμενον κύκλον λήξιν εἶναι καὶ χώραν ψυχῶν λογικῶν ἀπεφάνοντο.

¹⁰⁴ The following objection stated by Philoponus earlier in the discussion might be another allusion to the same Neoplatonic theory of soul-vehicles: οὐτε ὁ αὐτὸς αἰετῶν ψυχῶν ἀριθμὸς ἀνεισί τε καὶ κἀτεισιν, ἵνα καὶ τὰ ἀγχοειδῆ σώματα αὐτῶν τὸν αὐτὸν τόπον ἀναπλήροῖ μήτε λείψεντα μήτε πλεονάσαντα πῶποτε (115, 21–4 Hayduck).

¹⁰⁵ His own view of the Milky Way is presented in *Opif.* 3,12 (144,23–145,15), discussion in Scholten 1996, 404–6.

¹⁰⁶ For a detailed analysis of the Neoplatonic doctrines, see Finamore & Dillon, 2002, esp. 149–53. Our 50 is a part of Iamblichus' *De an.* sec. 26, Finamore & Dillon.

¹⁰⁷ "Descent" proper (ζάθοδος) is the last stage of soul's downward process. The whole process includes its transcendent being (ὑπόστασις) and its "sowing" (σπορά),

descending souls commensurately to their respective rank, in the process of descent. (3) The third group of Platonists differs from (1) and has in common with (2) (a) that the souls descend from intracosmic places as well;¹⁰⁸ but differs in (b) not recognising divine lots as playing a role in such descents. The mechanism of descent on this third view is not further specified, but Iamblichus indicates that there are several types, of which the main two involve either (i) a transfer from some special body of fine texture (coming from the Milky Way, or heavenly spheres, or around the moon); or (ii) a transfer from another solid body.¹⁰⁹

Heraclides' view according to which souls constitute the Milky Way is appended to this third tenet, represented by the two shadowy figures of Eratosthenes and Ptolemy the Platonist,¹¹⁰ and still more mysterious "others," according to whom soul "is always a body," transferring (at birth) from a lighter, finer body into the hard, earthy one.¹¹¹ Apparently, according to this theory, the soul is somehow distinct from its bodily receptacle (the word *okhêma*, "vehicle," is never used in this passage), so that its ascents and descents are construed as the processes in which it leaves one kind of receptacle only to enter another one, but is distinct from both. This kind of theory would have been a target of the argument developed by Alexander of Aphrodisias against soul's movement cited by Simplicius in his commentary on *Physics* 6.4:

Alexander here, pulling everything to his own doctrine of the soul which says that the soul is inseparable from body, says that this is clear also from the present argument: (1) if the soul is incorporeal and partless, (2) what is partless does not move, if something of a moving thing is that from which it moves, and something, into

i.e. coming to be associated with the cosmic god, and finally its embodiment in the world of generation. (See Finamore & Dillon 2002, 150–1).

¹⁰⁸ Iamblichus *De anima* 26 (54, 8–14 Finamore & Dillon).

¹⁰⁹ Both types are anticipated by Plotinus in *Enn.* 4.3.9.1–8, who may be Iamblichus' source.

¹¹⁰ On this Ptolemy, see Dihle 1957 (the argument is that this Ptolemy is identical with Ptolemy the Gharib); on Eratosthenes, see Solmsen 1942, who argues that this is the Alexandrian scientist of the second century B.C. Cf. also Haase 1965, 351 n.54 ("der unbekante Ptolemaios, wohl ein Jamblich nahestehender alexandrinischer Platoniker des 4. Jh. n. Chr.").

¹¹¹ Wilamowitz 1932, 535: "Sehr wertvoll ist die Angabe, daß die Seele immer einen Körper hat, auch wenn sie von dem irdisch-materiellen gelöst ist."

which it moves, (3) and what is not moving is not separated. (4) Some philosophers, he says, trying to avoid this incongruity, fit around it some body as a vehicle, unaware that by virtue of this they either (4a) say that body goes through body, seeing that the soul enters every body while being with a body, or (4b) separate it even from this [body] and make it move by itself as it enters into bodies. (964, 14–23 Diels)

On Alexander's own theory, soul is incorporeal, inseparable from body and immobile.¹¹² The argument he presents here shows that it is inseparable from body if it is incorporeal and partless, the intermediary step being that it is immobile since it is partless. The opponents to whom he refers supply a bodily vehicle in order to make the soul mobile. Probably his information about the nature of the vehicle was not specific, because Alexander sketches two refutations of this move, one (4a) for the version according to which the soul itself is corporeal, another (4b) for the version according to which it is not corporeal. As we can see, Alexander does not make any allowance for a special status of "fine-textured" vehicle: for him it is either "corporeal," i.e. on a par with a "shell-like" body (with the paradox of two bodies occupying the same place ready at hand), or incorporeal, in which case the move does not actually salvage the argument of the opponents, but only postpones his conclusion by one step. It is clear that his opponents are Platonists, and that they adopt some version of a corporealist theory of soul similar to the ones described by Iamblichus.

Iamblichus does not mention light as a specific stuff of which the soul is made according to Heraclides. The soul-stuff is captured by a more general description, i.e. a "finer-textured" body.

3. Light-like Soul: Concept and Arguments

The theory of light-like soul is attributed to Heraclides in several doxographical sources, in a very similar, terse wording in each case. The sources include Tertullian, Macrobius, Ps.-Plutarch, Theodoretus and Philoponus. The first four (probably going back to the same source)¹¹³

¹¹² *An.* 17, 9–11; cf. Kupreeva 2003, 315–6.

¹¹³ On the place of Tertullian, Ps.-Plutarch and Theodoretus in the doxographical tradition, see Mansfeld & Runia 1997.

use "light" or "light-like" as a key term in the definition of soul; Philoponus uses "ethereal."¹¹⁴

Doxographical fragments give us very little information about the motives behind this definition of the soul. It is significant that Heraclides' tenet is grouped together with the views of "materialists" and "corporealists." There are no ostensible links with the eschatological or ethical motifs of the story of Empedotimus (and *vice versa*, the extant fragments of the Empedotimus story have little to say about the background theory of the soul). The closest we get to an argument in favour of this definition is the text of Plutarch's *On "Live Unknown"* 6 (48).

3.1 "Epistemological" Argument: The Evidence of Plutarch

In 48, the light-like nature of the soul is connected with the thesis that knowledge is the object of soul's natural desire. This latter thesis is not found in any extant fragment of Empedotimus' story, but the attribution of Plutarch's anonymous doctrine to Heraclides is accepted by most scholars, and many (though not all) consider the argument "from knowledge" to be a likely part of Heraclides' theory.¹¹⁵

Bignone took the argument to be a part of Heraclides' anti-Epicurean polemic and traced it back to the etymology *sophia*—*sapheia* attributed to early Aristotle (*On Philosophy*, fr. 8 Ross). The Aristotelian origin of this fragment has been convincingly called into question by W. Haase, who has shown that the etymology comes from the late Neoplatonic exegesis of Aristotle's *Metaphysics* 2.¹¹⁶ Even if the argument in Plutarch precedes the Neoplatonic one, the problem with it is that it is not specific enough to provide good grounds for an exact attribution.

Plato uses the parable of the Sun after the discussion of knowledge and *doxa* (474B3–480A10) underscoring the difference between

¹¹⁴ On the terminological discrepancy, see below. Diels 1879a, 214; Moraux 1963, 1194; cf. Untersteiner 1963, 266. Moraux expresses doubts whether Heraclides used the term "ethereal," and regards it as a Neoplatonic modification of the original definition. Moraux 1963, 1194: "die Neuplatoniker hielten bekanntlich den Aither für eine lichtartige, feinstoffliche Substanz. Es ist daher möglich daß der von Joh. Philoponus bezugte Ausdruck nur eine neuplatonische Übertragung der genuinen definition ist." On this assumption, the Neoplatonists would be assimilating Heraclides' definition to their own doctrine of soul-vehicles.

¹¹⁵ Cf. in favor of this attribution: Moraux 1195–6; Dalino 1998, 69; Gottschalk 1980, 105–6 points out that this argument does not commit its proponent to the belief in light-like soul.

¹¹⁶ Haase 1965; cf. Luna 2001, 193.

the former and the latter. The similarity between *philosophoi* and *philotheamones* initially pointed out by Socrates (475E1) is obliterated in the rest of the argument, and the parables emphasise a distance between the two cognitive states. Aristotle, in the beginning of *Metaphysics* 1.1, argues that the love of sense perceptions is an indication that “all humans desire knowledge” (980a21–7). Aristotle wants to stress the continuity where Plato emphasises the difference, so that the love of sense perception is still regarded as a proof, and the common ground, of the desire for knowledge.

In Alexander’s commentary on *Metaphysics*, Aristotle’s argument is presented in terms of Hellenistic discussions of *telos*:

Since knowledge is a perfection of the soul which possesses unqualified cognition, and particularly of rational soul, and still more of the rational soul whose end is contemplation; and since the perfection of each particular thing is the good, and each thing has its being and preservation in the good, therefore he [Aristotle] added that generally “all people by nature desire knowledge,” i.e. naturally (*autophuōs*) they love knowledge since it is their perfection. (1, 4–9 Hayduck)

The love of sense perceptions, itself an indication of the love of knowledge, is explained by a natural tendency towards the proper *telos*, in a way which is characteristic of discussions of the human end in the Hellenistic schools.

The argument reported by Plutarch displays some structural affinities with this latter type of reasoning. Light and knowledge are made parallel because they are both agreeable to the soul; and it is this character of pleasure common to both that is supposed to clinch the argument.

A version of this argument, couched in terms of the Stoic theory of “appropriation” is found in Hierocles’ *Principles of Ethics* as a part of a series of proofs of the innateness of self-love:

For nature is well capable of instilling a strong love for themselves even in such [viz. little and simple beings]. Therefore, it seems to me, the young children do not bear it easily when they are locked up in houses that are dark and deprived of any sound. For intensifying their sense-organs and not being able to hear and see they get an impression of self-destruction, and are therefore disturbed. There-

fore nurses aptly tell them to close their eyes: for the fact that the privation of sights happened voluntarily and not by force soothes fear. (*Principles*, 7.3–13)¹¹⁷

Here we have the states of darkness and acoustic deprivation that are naturally disagreeable and thus indicate that we are in our “natural” state when our sense-organs are active, this in turn being further evidence for our innate self-love. The fear of darkness is explained by the impression of self-destruction produced by an active sense organ when it is deprived of its proper objects. In Plutarch’s argument, it was assumed that soul itself is light, and thus it seeks light and shuns darkness.

Who would be Plutarch’s “philosophers,” apart from Heraclides? De Lacy and Einarson give a useful reference to *Roman Questions* 281, where Plutarch tries to explain why Roman augurs customarily have their lanterns open. He comes up with the following suggestion:

Were they like the Pythagoreans, who made small matters symbols of great matters, forbidding men to sit on a peck measure or to poke a fire with a sword; and even so did the men of old make use of many riddles, especially with reference to priests; and is the question of the lantern of this sort?

For the lantern is like the body which encompasses the soul; the soul within is a light and the part of it that comprehends and thinks should be ever open and clear-sighted and should never be closed nor remain unseen. (281A8–B5, trans. Babbitt)

Here the view is invoked in the Pythagorean context; but it is not clear that Plutarch has in mind any specific source: this argument looks like

¹¹⁷ δεινὴ γ(ἀρ) ἡ φύσις κ(αἰ) τοῖς τοιοῖσδε(ε) σφ(ώ)ν(ν) αὐτ(ῶ)ν ἐντήξ(αι) σφοδρὸν ἡμερον [τ]ῶ τ(ῆ)ν σωτηρίαν ἀλλως ἄ(πο)ρον ὑπάρχειν. ταῦτη ἄ[ρ]α δοκεῖ μοι κ(αἰ) τὰ νεαρά π(α)δ[ι]άγια μὴ ῥαδίως φέρον κ(ατα)κλειόμενα ζοφεροῖς οἴκοις κ(αἰ) πάσ(ης) φων(ῆ)ς ἀμετόχοις ἐνεῖνοντα γ(ἀρ) τὰ (αἰ)σθητήρια κ(αἰ) μηδὲν μητ’ ἀκούσ(αι) μητ’ ἰδεῖν δ[υ]νάμενα φαντασίαν ἀν(αι)ρῆσεως αὐτ(ῶ)ν] λαμβά[ν]ει κ(αἰ) δ(ιὰ) τοῦτο δυσανα[σ]χεται. διὸ κ(αἰ) φ[ι]λοτέχνως (αἰ) τί[τ]θ(αι) πα[ρ]εγγυῶσιν αὐτοῖς ἐ(πι)μύειν τοῖς ὀφθ(αλμοῦς) παρηγορεῖ γ(ἀρ) τὸν φόβον τ[ὸ] ἐ[θ]ελουσία κ(αἰ) μὴ ὑπ’ ἀνάγκης γε[ν]έσθ(αι) τ(ῆ)ν ἀ[π]οστέρησιν] τί(ῶ)ν] ὄρατ(ῶ)ν. τινὰ [δ]ι(ὲ) αὐτ(ῶ)ν κ(αἰ) διὰ παρ[εγγυήσε]ω[ς] τοὺς ὀφθ(αλμοῦς) ἐπιμύει, τῷ πληκτικῷ ἀντί[σ]ταθ(αι) τοῦ σκοτους] οὐκ ἐξαρκ(ῶ)ν]τα (text from Bastianini–Long).

a rationalization.¹¹⁸ This passage is valuable because it shows us the ease with which Plutarch invokes philosophers' views, adjusts them to fit the tasks of his own argument, and does not hesitate to improve the details and links when necessary. The point about soul-light is needed here to fit the simile of "lantern"—and it is readily available along with the argument, according to which the part that corresponds to light should be kept open.

It might be that in *On "Live Unknown"* 6 we are also dealing with Plutarch's rationalization of the point being proved rather than a precise report of Heraclides. The analogy between light as a physical state and an "enlightened" cognitive or moral state is commonplace in Plutarch.¹¹⁹ Plutarch's general reference to "philosophers" need not exclude Heraclides. However, as such, it does not provide enough evidence for any specific attribution.

3.2 The Fifth Element?

It has been pointed out by scholars that a feature of Heraclides' definition of the soul which makes it distinct among the theories developed in the circle of Plato and Aristotle is its direct appeal to a certain cosmological principle as the main physical constituent of the soul.¹²⁰ There has been a tendency to regard this cosmological principle, namely light or light-like body, as some sort of a counterpart to Plato's fifth regular solid. It may be useful to summarise the main points of Plato's theory of elements which may be thought to have parallels in Heraclides' doctrines.

Plato describes the forms of five regular solids (*Tim.* 53C–55C) and assigns four of them to the four elements of traditional (post-Empedoclean) cosmology: tetrahedron (pyramid) to fire, hexahedron (cube) to earth, octahedron to water and icosahedron to air (*Tim.* 55D–56A). Each of the planes that make up a solid figure is further analysed into its basic constituents, right-angled triangles (of which there are two types: isosceles, for the cube, and scalene for pyramid, octahedron

¹¹⁸ In the end he rejects it and adopts a different, more "pragmatic" explanation of the custom. On Plutarch's sources in this work, see Rose 1924, Valgiglio 1976, van der Stockt 1987.

¹¹⁹ cf. *Def. Orac.* 433D2–E5, *Curios.* 515B1–D2, *Amat.* 765B5–D9.

¹²⁰ Moraux 1963, 1192–5; Gottschalk 1980, 102–7; Isnardi Parente 1979, 226–33; Annas 1992, 31–2; Reiche 1993; Dalfino 1998.

and icosahedron). These triangles are the basic constituents of the processes of generation and destruction. Plato says that they are the principles of the elements, to the extent to which these can be captured by the account based on likelihood and necessity.¹²¹ The fifth solid figure, dodecahedron, is not subject to this analysis (in fact, it cannot be), but Plato says that god used it when "painting" the whole.¹²² Plato considers the question whether the number of the worlds constructed in this way could be unlimited or at least plural: the latter suggestion is pondered and then dismissed without an argument.¹²³ There are three types of elemental transformation: (i) the particles of earth can only be transformed into the particles of earth;¹²⁴ (ii) the particles of water (more complex) are broken down into "lighter" ones of air and fire;¹²⁵ (iii) the lighter particles (air, fire) combine to yield a more massive figure of an icosahedron (water).¹²⁶ The mechanism of transformation is the same in all three types: the elemental solids that are changed are broken up by the pressure of the solids of a different shape, so that their constituent planes become free to enter a new geometric structure, which has to be one of the solid bodies. Thus the elements are present in a body in the form of solid particles which are changeable; Plato points out that solids come in different sizes.¹²⁷

Plato's "geometrical" theory of elements was clearly a subject of lively discussion in the Academy. Some early sources suggest that Plato also assigned the dodecahedron to a fifth cosmic element. Speusippus is reported as mentioning the "five figures assigned to the cosmic elements"¹²⁸ in his work *On Pythagorean Numbers*, among other topics, whose sequence suggests a close dependence on the *Timaeus*.¹²⁹

¹²¹ *Tim.* 53D4–6.

¹²² *Tim.* 55C: ἐτι δὲ οὐσης συστάσεως μίας πέμπτης, ἐπὶ τὸ πᾶν ὁ θεὸς αὐτῆ κατεχρήσατο ἐκεῖνο διαζωγράφων. Cf. Wyttenbach's reference to *Phaedo* 110B ([εἶναι ἢ γῆ] ... ὥσπερ αἱ δωδεκάσκιτοι σφαῖραι) cited by Cornford 1937, 219 n.1, who explains that διαζωγράφων means "making a pattern of animal figures" with reference to all the constellations.

¹²³ *Tim.* 55C–D.

¹²⁴ *Tim.* 56D1–6.

¹²⁵ *Tim.* 56D6–E2.

¹²⁶ *Tim.* 56E2–7.

¹²⁷ *Tim.* 57C–D, discussion in Cornford 1937, 230–9.

¹²⁸ περὶ τε τῶν πέντε σχημάτων ἃ τοῖς κοσμικοῖς ἀποδίδονται στοιχείοις. Speusippus, fr. 122 Isnardi Parente.

¹²⁹ Moraux 1963, 1192 thinks that Speusippus himself developed the theory of the

The report on Xenocrates cited by Simplicius says that this element is aether.¹³⁰ The only evidence for this view in the Platonic corpus comes from the *Epinomis* (now agreed to be by Plato's student Philip of Opus): the five solid bodies, viz. fire, water, air, earth and ether,¹³¹ are contrasted with the soul which belongs to a "different kind" that is incorporeal.¹³² It should be noticed that aether, although described as the "fifth" element (in addition to Plato's four), is not the "divine" element in this system: divine bodies are said to be composed predominantly of fire; and aether is the layer between fire and air.¹³³ This in fact is in agreement with Plato's description of aether as the brightest and clearest kind of air in *Tim.* 58C–D and *Phd.* 111B. Philip's doctrine develops Plato's view of the particulate structure of matter and extends it to the fifth element.

A different version of the "fifth element" theory is found in Aristotle, who does not accept the geometrical construction of the elements, and develops instead his own qualitative theory, while sharing the view that the four elements form the material basis of the sublunary cosmos,

fifth element, although admits that it is impossible to say whether this element was outermost as in Aristotle or fully intracosmic as in the *Epinomis*. Cf. Isnardi Parente 1980 *ad loc.*

¹³⁰ *Ap. Simpl. In Phys.* 1165, 33 (= 264 Isnardi Parente, 53 Heinze): ὅστε ὁ αἰθήρ πέμπτου ἄλλο τι σῶμα ἀπλοῦν ἐστὶ καὶ αὐτῷ [sc. τῷ Πλάτωνι] παρὰ τὰ τέσσαρα στοιχεῖα. Cf. *Simpl. In Cael.* 12,22 (= 265 Isnardi Parente, 53 Heinze), *In Cael.* 87,23 = 266 Isnardi Parente, 53 Heinze). Discussions in Cornford 1937, 221, Isnardi Parente 1982, 433–5 (who notes that the order in Simplicius is the same as in the *Epinomis*).

¹³¹ *Epin.* 981C5–8: πέντε οὖν τῶν ὄντων τῶν σωμάτων, πῦρ χρῆ φάναί καὶ ὕδωρ εἶναι καὶ τρίτον αἴερα, τέταρτον δὲ γῆν, πέμπτου δὲ αἰθέρα, τούτων δ' ἐν ἡγεμονίας ἕκαστον ζῶον πολὺ καὶ παντοδαπὸν ἀποτελεῖσθαι.

¹³² *Epin.* 981B: στερεὰ δὲ σώματα λέγεσθαι χρῆ κατὰ τὸν εἰκότα λόγον πέντε, ἐξ ὧν κάλλιστα καὶ ἄριστά τις ἂν πλάττοι. τὸ δὲ ἄλλο γένος ἅπαν ἔχει μορφὴν μίαν· οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν ἀσώματον ὅτι τ' ἄλλο γίγνεται ἂν καὶ χρώμα οὐδὲν οὐδαμῶς οὐδέ ποτ' ἔχον, πλὴν τὸ θεϊότατον ὄντως ψυχῆς γένος.

¹³³ *Epin.* 984B6–C1: αἰθέρα μὲν γὰρ μετὰ τὸ πῦρ θῶμεν, ψυχὴν δ' ἐξ αὐτοῦ τιθώμεν πλάττειν ζῶα δύναμιν ἔχοντα, ὡς περ τῶν ἄλλων γενῶν, τὸ πολὺ μὲν τῆς αὐτοῦ φύσεως, τὰ δὲ μικρότερα συνδεσμοῦ χάριν ἐκ τῶν ἄλλων γενῶν. μετὰ δὲ τὸν αἰθέρα ἐξ αἴερος πλάττειν τὴν ψυχὴν γένος ἕτερον ζῶων, καὶ τὸ τρίτον ἐξ ὕδατος. "After fire let us take up ether. We may suppose that soul fashions living things out of it which (like the other kinds of living things) are for the most part characterized by that substance, but which also possess smaller amounts of the other kinds in order to bond them together. After ether, soul fashions a different kind of living things out of air, and a third out of water" (trans. McKirahan).

the region of change *par excellence*. Aristotle does introduce a further element outside this cosmos as the substrate of heavenly (circular) motions, which is not subject to three other kinds of change (coming-to-be and perishing, growth and diminution, qualitative alteration) and does not possess either weight or lightness.¹³⁴ The term "fifth element" is never used in the authentic works of Aristotle, but does occur in later reports.¹³⁵

One of the controversial issues raised by this indirect tradition was whether Aristotle at all periods believed in the transcendent unmoved mover as the divine principle, or whether there was a distinct stage of immanent "cosmic" theology, which later came to be either revised or completely abandoned in favor of the former belief. This "immanent" stage was thought to be connected with the idea of the fifth divine element which fills the cosmos and accounts for the existence of mind and intellect.

Some reports of Heraclides' views are couched in terms similar to the reports of early Aristotle,¹³⁶ and his views on the nature of the soul were regarded as indirect evidence for the existence and lasting influence of Aristotle's "cosmic theology" in antiquity.¹³⁷

Morax has argued that Heraclides identified his light with Plato's fifth element,¹³⁸ to the same effect M. Isnardi Parente has treated the quest for the "fifth element" as a reply of the Academy to the problem of cosmological interpretation of the five regular solids posited

¹³⁴ *Cael.* 1.3, 269b18–270a35. Comprehensive discussion of Aristotle's fifth element in Morax 1963, 1196–1231; recent discussion of *Cael.* in Falcon 2001.

¹³⁵ Most important Hellenistic passages: Cicero, *Tusc.* 1.22; *Ac.* 1.26; *Fin.* 4.12; *Nat. Deor.* 1.33, cf. *Tusc.* 1.41, 1.65; *Nat. Deor.* 2.44; further references and detailed discussion in Morax 1963, 1209–31.

¹³⁶ Cf. for instance the Epicurean criticism of both in Cic. *Nat. Deor.* 1.13.

¹³⁷ This was suggested in Bignone 1936, II, 598–600. Luck 1953, 38–9, argued, on the contrary, that Heraclides' was the first in the long series of misinterpretations of Aristotle's theory of soul-entelechy. Morax 1963 argued against both views. Discussion of Aristotelian theology is outside the scope of this paper. For the state of the question and analysis of older literature, see Morax 1963. For further discussions of the problem, see Lefèvre 1971; Bos 2003 (neither of whom mention Heraclides).

¹³⁸ Morax 1963, 1194–5.

by Plato in the *Timaeus*.¹³⁹ In a recent study by Dalfino, the affinities between Heraclides and Plato are also emphasized.¹⁴⁰

The fragment regarded as evidence for Heraclides' theory of the fifth element comes from Plutarch's *On the E at Delphi* 390A:

Nevertheless, even if this world of ours is the only one ever created, as Aristotle also thinks, even ours, he says, is in a way put together through the union of five worlds, of which one is of earth, another of water, a third of fire, a fourth of air; and the fifth some call the heavens,¹⁴¹ others light, and others aether, and others call this very [thing]¹⁴² a fifth substance, which alone of the bodies has by nature a circular motion that is not the result of any compelling power or any other incidental cause. Wherefore also Plato, apparently noting the five most beautiful and complete forms among those found in Nature, pyramid, cube, octahedron, icosahedron, and dodecahedron, appropriately assigned each to each (trans. Babbitt modified).

It has been suggested that "others call light" must refer to Heraclides.¹⁴³ This attribution does raise several questions.

Plutarch's list is supposed to include the doctrines of those who believe in the oneness of our world; this view is contrasted with Plato's suggestion of the plurality of the *kosmoi* in *Tim.* 55C7–D6 (discussed by Plutarch immediately before this passage).¹⁴⁴ Heraclides with his belief in the infinite cosmos might seem to be the odd-one-out in this list. But perhaps his belief in infinity is compatible with the postulate

¹³⁹ Isnardi Parente 1979, 226–9, esp. 228. She also adduces the report of a Pythagorean theory of elements by Alexander Polyhistor in the *Πυθαγορικά ὑπομνήματα* as evidence for the existence of the post-Platonic Academic tradition which described soul as ἀπόσπασμα αἰθέρος (DL 8.28) (cf. *ibid.* 97 and n. 133). But it has to be noted that the report continues: καὶ θερμοῦ καὶ ψυχροῦ, making the parallel less precise.

¹⁴⁰ Dalfino 1998.

¹⁴¹ There is a textual problem here, and I am inclined to accept the suggestion of Wyttienbach and read οἱ μὲν οὐρανόν where the MSS have οὐρανόν; cf. Moraux 1963, 1194.

¹⁴² 390A3. I take αὐτὸ τοῦτο to refer back to the τὸν δὲ πέμπτον.

¹⁴³ Boyancé *ap.* Wehrli 93: "it can only be Heraclides," cited approvingly by Moraux 1963.

¹⁴⁴ *De E* 389F: πολλὰ δ' ἄλλα τοιαῦτα, ἔφην ἐγώ, παρελθὼν τὸν Πλάτωνα προσάξομαι λέγοντα κόσμον ἓνα, ὡς εἶπερ εἰσι παρὰ τούτων ἕτερον καὶ μὴ μόνος οὗτος εἷς, πέντε τοὺς πάντας ὄντας καὶ μὴ πλείονας. Babbitt's reference to *Tim.* 31B is imprecise.

of oneness. The report that we have (74) goes back to the same doxographical source as the reports about the soul; it says that "Seleucus the Erythrean and Heraclides of Pontus [believe] that the world is infinite."¹⁴⁵ This view is distinguished from the view according to which "there are infinite worlds" attributed to Anaximander, Anaximenes, Archelaus, Xenophanes, Diogenes, Leucippus, Democritus and Epicurus in 'Aëtius' 2.1.3b10–14.¹⁴⁶ Another group of doxographical fragments (75A–D) tells us that "each of the stars is a world": there are minor differences in the way the physical constitution of such a world is described in different fragments, but it seems clear that each star is supposed to consist of the traditional elements, of which three are mentioned, in different combinations: earth, air and aether.¹⁴⁷

It is tempting to associate souls with the element of the intermundia. Notably, astronomical fragments (75A–D) mention aether rather than light.¹⁴⁸ Philoponus' fr. 47, where soul is defined as *aitherion sōma*, if accurate,¹⁴⁹ would provide a bridge between the two groups of fragments.¹⁵⁰ It might be relevant that our Greek sources for 46 describe soul not exactly as "light,"¹⁵¹ but as "light-like" (*phōtoeidēs*).

In any case, there is a question what theory of light Heraclides adopted. According to Plato's explanation in *Tim.* 45B–D, daylight

¹⁴⁵ 'Aet.' 2.1.5.b4–6: Σέλευκος ὁ Ἐρυθραῖος καὶ Ἡρακλείδης ὁ Ποντικὸς ἀπειροὺς τὸν κόσμον. ([Plutarch] mentions Seleucus alone.)

¹⁴⁶ The argument attached to the fragment of Seleucus cited by Abū Bakr al-Rāzī in his *Metaphysics* (*Maqālah fī mā ba'd al-tabī'ah*): "If the world is limited, is it limited by something or by nothing? If by something, this agrees with my claim. If by nothing, it must be able to be impressed against the nothing and touch it, in the same way as it is limited by it" (113, 13–6 Kraus) appears to deny the existence of void and argue for the infinity of one cosmos. For discussion see Pines 1986, on Heraclides *ibid.*, 216.

¹⁴⁷ 75A: "earth, air and aether in the unlimited aether"; B: "aether in the unlimited"; C: "earth and aether in the unlimited air"; D: "earth and air." Diels secluded the first "aether" in 75A (as an error from scribal correction of dittography of "air"). On this reading, a star-world will comprise earth and air in the unlimited aether: a plausible but not sufficiently proven picture. In any case, it is clear that the traditional elements constitute all the stars: the nature of intermundia is not entirely clear. Cf. 76A–D, where the moon is said to be 'earth surrounded with mist'.

¹⁴⁸ The term is present in 75A and C.

¹⁴⁹ See pp. 113–4 above.

¹⁵⁰ Cf. Untersteiner 1963, 266; Moraux 1963; Isnardi Parente 1979.

¹⁵¹ This is the Latin translation, 46B (*lux*) and 46C (*lumen*).

is akin to the “mild” kind of fire within us: coalescing together, these two form the organ of vision. In his discussion of the elements at 58C, Plato distinguishes the kind of fire “which does not burn but provides the light to the eyes.” Ultimately, light consists of particularly fine pyramid-shaped particles.¹⁵² Thus the idea that the heavenly element should be directly present in one of its forms within the soul is familiar from Plato himself: that is the role of fire in his theory of vision.¹⁵³ According to Aristotle, light is not a body, but a state of the transparent when a source of light (fire or aether) is present.¹⁵⁴ Aristotle’s theory of light in the *On the Soul* is contrasted with two, or possibly three, rival “corporeal” theories:

Now, what the transparent and the light is, has been stated, namely, that it is (i) neither fire, (ii) nor body in general, (iii) nor yet an emanation of any body (for this way it would still be a body), but the presence of fire or something like that in the transparent: for neither is it possible for two bodies to be in the same [place] (2.7, 418b13–7).¹⁵⁵

While (i) is most probably Plato’s, it would be interesting to know the identity of the proponents of the (ii) and/or (iii). There is no way to tell, but this description would fit with what we know of Heraclides and the way he was understood by the compiler of the ‘Aëtius’ who grouped his doctrine of light-like soul with corporeal theories. Immediately after this passage, Aristotle goes on to criticise the corporeal theory of light put forward by Empedocles, “or anybody else.” This latter addition might indicate that corporeal theory of light did have some following in the Academy.

¹⁵² See Cornford 1937, 247.

¹⁵³ Some terminological parallels between this story and the fragments of Empedotimus’ vision were pointed out by Reiche, who compared the description of Empedotimus’ vision which takes place “at high noon” (ἐν μεσημβρία σταθερά, 54A), with the μεθήμερινον φῶς of *Tim.* 45C3 (Reiche 1993, 166–8), cf. also *Crat.* 418C5–6.

¹⁵⁴ *An.* 2.7, 418b11–3: τὸ δὲ φῶς οἷον χρώμα ἐστὶ τοῦ διαφανοῦς, ὅταν ἢ ἐντελεχεία διαφανὲς ὑπὸ πυρός ἢ τοιοῦτου οἷον τὸ ἄνω σώμα· καὶ γὰρ τοῦτο τι ὑπάρχει ἐν καὶ ταυτῶν.

¹⁵⁵ τί μὲν οὖν τὸ διαφανὲς καὶ τί τὸ φῶς, εἴρηται, ὅτι οὔτε πῦρ οὔθ’ ὄλως σώμα οὐδ’ ἀπορροή σώματος οὐδενός (εἴη γὰρ ἂν σώμα τι καὶ οὕτως), ἀλλὰ πυρός τοιοῦτου τινός παρουσία ἐν τῷ διαφανεῖ· οὐδὲ γὰρ δύο σώματα ἅμα δυνατόν ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ εἶναι.

In placing his aether after all sublunary elements and (possibly) describing it as “light-like,” Heraclides is close to Aristotle. But he most probably does not adopt Aristotle’s distinction between the luminescent body and light itself as the state of the transparent medium.¹⁵⁶ 63 list Heraclides among those who explained the mechanism of sense perception by the theory of pores. 64 claims that Heraclides is no different from Democritus in postulating *eidōla*, presumably in the theory of perception. Although both reports are very short and general, it is clear that the mechanism of sense perception does involve some sort of corporeal agent which enters the sense organ. What could be the nature of this agent, according to Heraclides, we do not know. That such a theory would be conceivable in the circle of Plato is clear from Plato’s own explanation of the mechanism of sense perception in terms of the elemental particles in *Tim.* 65B–68D.

There is a further question about the relation between this theory of soul and the theory of matter attributed to Heraclides in the sources. Heraclides is reported to have put forward a corpuscular doctrine, whose main theoretical objects were “disjointed masses,” described as “qualitatively unlike” their compounds, but “subject to affection” and “breakable” (61, 62). The fact that the particles are breakable and changeable probably has to do with their loss and acquisition of new structure,¹⁵⁷ but we are not informed about the sort of structure in question. The idea may owe something to Plato’s theory of particles of different size constitutive of different kinds of sensible bodies.¹⁵⁸ There certainly is a question about the relation between the “masses” and the elements.

Heraclides’ theory can be compared with the theory of Xenocrates, to whom the sources attribute a theory of partless minimal elements of physical structure,¹⁵⁹ and at the same time a traditional theory of four elements.¹⁶⁰ According to Plutarch’s report in *On the Face in the Moon*, various combinations of these elements constitute heavenly bodies:

¹⁵⁶ In 50 discussed above, Heraclides’ view of the Milky Way is supposed to illustrate the view of those who thought of soul as a “fine-textured body.”

¹⁵⁷ The process of dissolution of elemental solids is described by Plato with the verbs (δια)λυθῆναι, μερίζεσθαι, καταθραυσθῆναι (*Tim.* 56D2, 3, 6, E4–5).

¹⁵⁸ *Tim.* 57C–D.

¹⁵⁹ Fr. 148–51 Isnardi Parente.

¹⁶⁰ Fr. 152 Isnardi Parente.

Xenocrates says that the stars and the sun are composed of fire and the first density, the moon of the second density and air that is proper to her, and the earth of water [and air] and the third kind of density, and that in general neither density all by itself nor subtlety is receptive of soul (trans. Cherniss).¹⁶¹

Xenocrates apparently distinguishes between the rarefied elements, which include fire, air and water, and “the density” which includes the earth and the corresponding dense material of which the heavenly bodies are composed. It seems that there are three “degrees” of density. It is not entirely clear in what way the minimal partless particles are connected with the traditional elements, but the fact that the latter are described in terms of states, namely dense and rarefied, suggests that this may have to do with the way the particles are “packed” in the aggregates. This option will have been available for Heraclides.

Since ancient sources frequently cite Heraclides and Asclepiades together for the theory of *anarmoi onkoi*, it may be useful to note Galen’s report in his account of the state of the breathless woman (89). According to Galen, in Heraclides’ dialogue *On the Woman Not Breathing*, the body of the woman who is alive in a comatose state is said to differ from the dead only in that “it has a small amount of heat in the middle parts of the body.” The reference to heat is meant to relate to the cause of the woman still being alive. We would like to hear more about the nature of this heat: according to Asclepiades, it would be adventitious upon the motion of bodily particles,¹⁶² but our report stops here, thus leaving the question open.

3.3 Heraclides and ΠΕΡΙ ΤΩΝ ΕΝ ΑΙΔΟΥ [ΚΑΘ’ ΑΙΔΗΝ] (80)

A further difficulty of reconstructing Heraclides’ theory of soul is that we know virtually nothing about the functions of the *embodied* soul. The text known as Tyrwhitt’s fragment 1, attributed in the MSS to Plutarch, entitled *Desire and Grief—Physical or Bodily Phenomena?*

¹⁶¹ 943E8–944A5: ὁ δὲ Ξενοκράτης τὰ μὲν ἄστρα καὶ τὸν ἥλιον ἐκ πυρός φησι καὶ τοῦ πρώτου πυκνοῦ συγκείσθαι τὴν δὲ σελήνην ἐκ τοῦ δευτέρου πυκνοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἰδίου ἀέρος τὴν δὲ γῆν ἐξ ὕδατος [καὶ ἀέρος] καὶ τοῦ τρίτου τῶν πυκνῶν· ὅπως δὲ μήτε τὸ πυκνὸν αὐτὸ καθ’ αὐτὸ μήτε τὸ μακρὸν εἶναι ψυχῆς δεκτικόν.

¹⁶² See e.g. Caelius Aurelianus, *De morbis acutis* 1.14.113; Anon. *Lond.* XXV 24 Diels; for a general survey, Vallance 1990.

(Πότερον ψυχῆς ἢ σώματος ἐπιθυμία καὶ λύπη) contains a reference to Heraclides’ work *On the Things in Hades* which has become a subject of debate in recent discussions of Peripatetic philosophies of mind.¹⁶³ The “fragment” is transmitted in three manuscripts of the fifteenth century, probably going back to the same archetype.¹⁶⁴ The question of authorship has been debated by early editors, but the current consensus seems to be that it is safe to attribute this text to Plutarch.¹⁶⁵ The passage from sec. 5 that mentions Heraclides — 80 in the present edition — runs as follows (the six divisions, a–f, are my own):

- (a) ἔνιοι δ’ ἀντικρυς καὶ δόξαν καὶ διαλογισμὸν εἰς τὸ σῶμα καταταίνουσι, οὐδ’ εἶναι αἰτίαν <τὸ> παράπαν ψυχῆς¹⁶⁶ λέγοντες ἀλλὰ τῆ τοῦ σώματος διαφορᾷ καὶ ποιότητι καὶ δυνάμει συντελεῖσθαι τὰ τοιαῦτα.
- (b) τὸ μὲν γὰρ Περί τῶν ἐν Αἴδου βιβλίον ἐπιγραφόμενον,
- (c) ἐν ᾧ τὴν ψυχὴν τῆ οὐσίας παρουραρχεῖν ἀποφαίνεται λόγος,
- (d) οἱ μὲν οὐδ’ εἶναι τὸ παράπαν Ἡρακλείδου νομίζουσιν
- (e) οἱ δὲ πρὸς ἀντιπαρεξαιρωμένην συντεταχθῆναι τῶν εἰρημένων ἐτέροις περὶ οὐσίας ψυχῆς·
- (f) οὕτω¹⁶⁷ δ’ οὖν γεγραμμένον ἀντικρυς ἀναιρεῖ τὴν οὐσίαν αὐτῆς, ὡς τοῦ σώματος ἔχοντος ἐν αὐτῷ τὰς εἰρημένας δυνάμεις πάσας.

(a) Some, on the contrary, squeeze the opinion and calculation into the body, saying that there is absolutely no cause on the part of the soul, but such things are accomplished jointly by the variation and quality and power of body. (b) For the book entitled *On the Things in Hades* (c) in which the argument has it that the soul is co-present with the substance, (d) some think is not by Heraclides at all, (e) while others think that he composed it for the sake of a counter-attack against what others said about the soul; (f) now, written in this way, it completely destroys its substance, by maintaining that the body has in itself all the said powers.

¹⁶³ See Caston 1997 and 2001, Sharples 2001.

¹⁶⁴ Harl. 5612 (h), Laur. 56,4 (i), Laur. 80.28 (k). On the manuscripts, see Pohlenz 1974, p. XXIII; 1953, p. IX; Sandbach 1969, 32 and n. (b).

¹⁶⁵ See Sandbach 1960 and 1969, 32–7, Pettine 1991, 5–13.

¹⁶⁶ ψυχῆς MSS (I checked Harl. 5612 and agree with Pohlenz and Sandbach that the reading is ψυχῆς) ψυχῆν Tyrwhitt followed by Wyttenbach, Wehrli and Sharples 2001, 157 n. 63.

¹⁶⁷ οὕτω MSS, ὅτω Dübner (followed by Pohlenz).

The text of (a) is problematic, and did not satisfy any of its editors. The MSS reading ψυχῆς can be translated meaningfully (e.g. as suggested above), but stylistically this is highly unlikely. The reading ψυχῆν is preferred by Wehrli because it makes it easy to keep the MSS reading αἰτίαν where Pohlenz conjectured οὐσίαν.¹⁶⁸ This reading certainly makes better sense than Pohlenz's conjecture.¹⁶⁹ The main claim seems to be quite general, namely that of the two contenders, it is body, not soul, that wins the day with the "some," who, on our reading, should include Heraclides.¹⁷⁰

The title of the book mentioned in (b) is also mentioned by Plutarch in *Reply to Colotes* 1115A (79), along with two others, namely *Zoroaster* and *Περὶ τῶν φυσικῶς ἀπορουμένων*, in the list of works where Xenocrates, Aristotle and the Peripatetics are said "constantly to differ with Plato, contradicting him about the most fundamental and far-reaching questions of natural philosophy."¹⁷¹

In (c) we probably find the particular point on which Heraclides was disagreeing with Plato. The claim that the soul is "present along with" the body is ambiguous in more than one way. The first and obvious difficulty is the scope of the concept of soul. The word οὐσία in the phrase τὴν ψυχῆν τῇ οὐσίᾳ παρουπάρχειν can refer either (i) to the substance of a living body or (ii) to the bodily mass (if we take the term in its later sense dependent on the Stoic usage). The context (bodily powers are mentioned twice in the passage) lends support to (i), but (ii) would be also true according to what we know of Hera-

¹⁶⁸ Caston 2001, 186 n. 26 defends the reading αἰτίαν but says nothing about the justification of ψυχῆν vs. ψυχῆς.

¹⁶⁹ There seems to be at least one more possibility of Cobet-style emendation keeping ψυχῆς, namely by dismantling the αἰτίαν as a result of dittography (ΕΙΝΑΙΤΙΑΝ → ΕΙΝΑΙΑΙΤΙΑΝ): οὐδ' εἶναι τι ἄν <τὸ> παρὰ τὴν ψυχῆς λέγοντες ἀλλὰ τῇ τοῦ σώματος διαφορᾷ καὶ ποιότητι καὶ δυνάμει συντελεῖσθαι τὰ τοιαῦτα. ("Saying that such things are nothing at all of the soul, but are the results of bodily differences, qualities or properties.") This gives a tolerable syntax and stylistically can be compared with 7.2: οἱ δὲ ταύτην ἀπογνόντες φιλόσοφοι φασὶ μήτε σώματος εἶναι τι μήτε ψυχῆς ἴδιον πάθος ἀλλὰ κτλ.

¹⁷⁰ I do not think there is a reason to suspect a lacuna before τὸ μὲν γὰρ, as Wehrli does.

¹⁷¹ ἐν οἷς πρὸς τὰ κυριώτατα καὶ μέγιστα τῶν φυσικῶν ὑπεναντιούμενοι τῷ Πλάτωνι καὶ μαχόμενοι διατελοῦσι 1115B1–2.

clides, and may be taken as generalizing (i) to say that soul can only be present in a body of some sort.¹⁷² The rare verb παρουπάρχειν is most frequently used to explain the verb παρεῖναι.¹⁷³

In (d) we have a report that Heraclides' book was regarded by some as spurious. *Reply to Colotes* 1115A makes no such suggestion; so Plutarch himself does not necessarily share this view. Others, (e), considered it to be written as an *antiparexagōgē*, as a *reductio ad absurdum*¹⁷⁴ of what others say about the being of the soul. Gottschalk sketched two possibilities: (i) this dialogue was "a rhetorical exercise advocating a view Heraclides did not really believe";¹⁷⁵ and (ii) "pseudo-Plutarch had an incomplete copy of Heraclides' dialogue and the authorities whom he consulted could not resolve his difficulties."¹⁷⁶ But (i) would not do full justice to the report of Plutarch in *Reply to Colotes* 1115A (whether or not he is taken to be the same as the author of Tyrwhitt fr. 1), who seems to take this dialogue as a serious work in which Heraclides disagrees with Plato. The "incompleteness" suggestion (ii) is on the slippery slope to an argument *ex silentio*. The unpalatable statement to which a reduction must lead presumably is that soul is not a real cause of the mental processes within the body: this is the interpretation given to (c) in (f), in agreement with (a).

We can take a closer look at the claims attributed to Heraclides in (a), (c) and (f).

¹⁷² Along the lines of 50 discussed above in 2.2.2.

¹⁷³ The term occurs in the whole corpus eleven times, only three times in literary texts apart from Plutarch, Greg. Nyss. *Liber de cognitione dei* 313.8 (referring to light and darkness) and Tzetzes *Chiliades* 3.70.194 (referring to the presence of θυμός described as πῦρ πνέων) and eight times in scholia, mostly to explain various forms of παρεῖναι (once ἐπίστασθαι). It is interesting to note that the word παρουπάρχειν is used by Aristotle in quasi-technical meaning to describe the nature of light in *De anima* 2.7 418b13–7 discussed above, p. 126.

¹⁷⁴ Sextus, *Math.* VII 150–4.

¹⁷⁵ Gottschalk 1980, 109.

¹⁷⁶ Gottschalk 1980, 109–10. This is the only way to accommodate the earlier hypothesis stated by Wilamowitz that the position discussed by [Plutarch] is presented by a character in the dialogue, and then criticised by another character who speaks for Heraclides. Wilamowitz, 1932, 533, n.1: "In Falle (viz. der *antiparexagōgē*) konnte eine Ansicht, die Herakleides nicht teilte und schliesslich überwand, wohl vorkommen, was auf dialogische Form führen könnte."

- (a) Soul does not cause mental processes; mental processes are caused by bodily powers.
- (c) Soul is co-present with the being (presumably of a living bodily substance).
- (f) Soul has no being (*ousia*) (of its own, apart from that mentioned in [c]).

The claims (a) and (c) could be a fair (if somewhat dry) description of the state of the soul in the traditional Greek underworld: the souls in Homer's Hades lose pretty much all their mental properties.¹⁷⁷ If Heraclides' dialogue for some reason focuses on this description and makes no reference to the concept of light-like soul and the soul-journey of the Empedotimus story, someone (especially if familiar with that concept and that story) could raise doubts about its authenticity. A reader with a dualistic agenda could also construe the claims (a) and (c) as (f), i.e. as a denial of "real" (separate, i.e. disembodied) existence to the soul.

Nonetheless, there is a way for Heraclides to be consistent in his views even in the light of this report. He could still believe in the light-like soul without making it the *only* cause of body's properties, including mental properties, if he assumed that there is a difference between its incarnate and discarnate state. This would not be out of line with the way Plato thought about these matters. In Plato's theory, the "embodied" tripartite soul, which is the seat of the main functions of a living body, is distinguished from the one that exists separately from the body. This "embodied" soul is its handicapped and subordinate state, where it can be described as "dependent" upon the body — temporarily.¹⁷⁸ Heraclides could hold both that our thoughts and opinions in this life are products of our embodied faculties, with the corporeal soul perhaps playing some contributory role (no clear evidence for this),¹⁷⁹ and that the soul in the absence of perishable body does not produce the same kind of mental states. This analysis inevi-

¹⁷⁷ Cf. Bremmer 1983, 74–88.

¹⁷⁸ Cf. the argument in the tenth book of the *Republic* (608Dff.), the dialogue where the doctrine of tripartite soul is otherwise quite central to the main argument. According to Heraclides, of course, transcendent soul itself has a special corporeal status; in this he differs from both Plato and the *Epinomis* (983D–984B).

¹⁷⁹ In Plato's psychology, separate soul seems to have the function of providing our beliefs and actions with the qualities of truth and intrinsic correctness (cf. *Republic* 611B5–614A8), whereas generating beliefs and actions is a function of embodied soul.

tably ends in speculative conjectures, but not pure fancy. Furthermore, we know of Heraclides' polemic against Plato, and one disagreement concerning the nature of the soul has to do with the status of the separate soul: according to Heraclides it has some physical (corporeal) properties.¹⁸⁰ In any case, I think Wehrli's view (followed by Caston and to some extent Sharples) that this passage is incompatible with Heraclides' theory of soul can be amended.¹⁸¹

Coda

Any reconstruction of Heraclides' doctrine of the soul is inevitably only tentative because of the state of the sources. The fragments show the relevance of Heraclides' theory in the context of discussions of the nature of the soul held in Plato's Academy of his day. The tension between the new, theoretically grounded physicalism of natural philosophy and the persistence of moral and religious agenda in psychology, which can be regarded as central to the philosophy of mind in the late Academy, is shared by Heraclides' doctrine of the soul. In the fragments, we can discern some elements of his approach to the solution of this tension: the account of soul is corporealist, and possibly physicalist, departing from both Plato's objective idealism and Aristotle's hylomorphism. The view that soul depends in its existence on a material with special physical properties will become one of the most popular options in Hellenistic philosophy, and will play some role in Hellenistic Peripatos.

¹⁸⁰ In this respect, the claim of soul's lack of causal power could be derived by reduction from the assumption that soul is incorporeal.

¹⁸¹ Wehrli *ad fr.* 72 (= 80); Caston 2001, 185–9; cf. Sharples 2001, 157 (Sharples discusses the passage as Dicaearchean, but says that the attribution is not certain). Caston argues that Heraclides' work is a polemical imitation of Dicaearchus, on the basis of the analogy of the report with fr. 19 of Dicaearchus. But there is a question whether this resemblance is owed to the respective original sources or to the reporting source(s). As indirect evidence for this polemic, Caston cites 1 (sec. 92) which says that Chamaeleon accused Heraclides of plagiarism (Caston mistranslates it as saying that Heraclides was the accuser [Caston 2001, 186 n. 25]). But this is hardly relevant to the alleged philosophical debate. Plut. *Adv. Colot.* 1115A on polemic against Plato would also need to be reconciled with this hypothesis.

Works Cited

- Annas, J. *Hellenistic Philosophy of Mind*. Berkeley, 1992.
- Armisen-Marchetti, M. (ed.) *Macrobe. Commentaire au Songe de Scipion*. Paris. Vol. 1, 2001, Vol. 2, 2003.
- Astbury, R. (ed.) *M. Terentii Varronis Saturarum Menippearum fragmenta*. Leipzig, 1985.
- Bergk, Th. *Opuscula philologica*. 2 vols. Halle, 1886.
- Bidez, J. *Eos, ou Platon et l'Orient*. Brussels, 1945.
- Bidez, J., and Cumont, F. *Les Mages hellénisés*. 2 vols. Paris, 1938.
- Bignone, E. *L'Aristotele Perduto e la Formazione filosofica di Epicuro*. Firenze, 1936.
- Bolton, J. D. P. *Aristeas of Proconnesus*. Oxford, 1962.
- Bos, A. P. *The Soul and its Instrumental Body: A Reinterpretation of Aristotle's Philosophy of Living Nature*. Leiden, 2003.
- Boyancé, P. "L'Abaris d'Héraclide le Pontique." *Revue des Études Anciennes [REA]* 36 (1934): 321–52.
- . *Études sur le Songe de Scipion*. Bordeaux and Paris, 1936.
- . *Le Culte des muses chez les philosophes grecques*. Paris, 1937.
- . "Le disque de Brindisi et l'apothéose de Séméle." *REA* 44 (1942): 191–216.
- . "La religion astrale de Platon à Cicéron." *Revue des Études Grecques* 65 (1952): 312–50.
- Bremmer, J. *The Early Greek Concept of the Soul*. Princeton, 1983.
- . *The Rise and Fall of the Afterlife*. London and New York, 2002.
- Büchner, K. *Somnium Scipionis: Quellen, Gestalt, Sinn*. (*Hermes. Einzelschriften* 36) Wiesbaden, 1976.
- Burkert, W. *Lore and Science in Ancient Pythagoreanism*. Cambridge, Mass., 1972.
- Capelle, P. *De luna stellis lacteo orbe animarum sedes*. Halle, diss., 1917.
- Caston, V. "Dicaearchus' Philosophy of Mind." In W. W. Fortenbaugh and E. Schütrumpf (eds.) *Dicaearchus of Messana: Text, Translation and Discussion (RUSCH X) [Dicaearchus]*. New Brunswick and London, 2001. 175–93.
- Cèbe, J.-P. (ed., trans., comm.). *Varron, Satires ménippées*. Rome, 1985–1999.

- Cherniss, H. "Notes on Plutarch's *De facie in orbe lunae*." *Classical Philology* 46/3 (1951): 137–58.
- Corssen, P. "In Damascii Platonici de orbe lacteo disputationem a Ioanne Philopono relatam animadversiones." *Rheinisches Museum [RhM]* 66 (1911): 493–9.
- . "Der Abaris des Heraklides Ponticus." *RhM* 67 (1912): 20–47.
- Cumont, Fr. *Lux perpetua*. Paris, 1949.
- . Curd, P. *The Legacy of Parmenides: Eleatic Monism and Later Presocratic Thought*. Princeton, 1998.
- Dalfino, M. C. "La dottrina dell'anima di Eraclide Pontico e le sue implicazioni etiche." *Elenchos* 19/1 (1998): 61–82.
- Diels, H. 1879a. *Doxographi Graeci*. Berlin, 1879.
- . 1879b. "Zu Cicero *Tusc.* I 19,43." *RhM* 34 (1879): 487–91.
- . "Reiskii animadversiones in Laertium Diogenem." *Hermes* 24 (1889): 302–25.
- Dieterich, A. *Nekyia: Beiträge zur Erklärung der neuentdeckten Petrusapokalypse*. Leipzig, 1893.
- Dihle, A. "Der Platoniker Ptolemaios." *Hermes* 85 (1957): 315–25.
- Dodds, E. R. "The Astral Body in Neoplatonism." In E. R. Dodds (ed.) *Proclus, The Elements of Theology*. Oxford, 1963. 313–21.
- Dubois, L. *Recherches sur le dialecte arcadien*. Vol. 2. Louvain-la-Neuve, 1983.
- Effe, B. *Studien zur Kosmologie und Theologie der Aristotelischen Schrift "Über die Philosophie"*. München, 1970.
- Eijk, P. J. van der. *Philoponus On Aristotle On the Soul 1.1–2*. London, 2005.
- Falcon, A. *Corpi e movimenti: Il De caelo di Aristotele e la sua fortuna nel mondo antico*. Naples, 2001.
- Festugière, A. J. (trans.) *Proclus. Commentaire sur la République*. 3 vols. Paris, 1970.
- Finamore, J. F., and Dillon, J. M. (ed., trans., comm.) *Iamblichus De anima*. Leiden, Boston, Köln, 2002.
- Fraschetti, A. "Eraclide Pontico e Roma 'città greca'." *A.I.O.N. (Annali dell'Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli). Dip. di Studi del Mondo Classico, sez. Filol.* 11 (1989): 81–95.
- Fraser, P. M., and Matthews, E. *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names [LGPN]* 3.A: The Peloponnese, Western Greece, Sicily, and Magna Graecia. Oxford, 1997.

- Frede, M. "Numenius." *Aufstieg und Niedergang des Römischen Welt* [ANRW] 2 36.2 (1987): 1034–75.
- Gilbert, O. *Die meteorologischen Theorien des griechischen Altertums*. Leipzig, 1907.
- Gottschalk, H. B. *Heraclides of Pontus*. Oxford, 1980.
- De Groot, J. *Aristotle and Philoponus on Light*. New York, London, 1991.
- Haase, W. "Ein vermeintliches Aristoteles-Fragment bei Johannes Philoponos." In H. Flashar and K. Gaiser (eds.) *Synusia: Festgabe für Wolfgang Schadewaldt zum 15. März 1965*. Pfullingen, 1965.
- Hirzel, R. *Der Dialog. Ein literarhistorischer Versuch*. Bd. 1–2. Leipzig, 1895.
- Isnardi Parente, M. *Studi sull'accademia platonica antica*. Florence, 1979.
- — — (ed.) *Speusippo: Frammenti*. Naples, 1980.
- — — (ed.) *Senocrate-Ermodoro: Frammenti*. Naples, 1982.
- Kidd, I. G. *Posidonius II (i–ii): The Commentary*. Cambridge, 1988.
- — —. "Theophrastus' *Meteorology*, Aristotle and Posidonius." In W. Fortenbaugh and D. Gutas (eds.) *Theophrastus, His Psychological, Doxographical, and Scientific Writings (RUSCH V)*. New Brunswick and London, 1992, 294–306.
- — —. "What is a Posidonian Fragment?" In G. W. Most (ed.) *Collecting Fragments / Fragmente sammeln*. Göttingen, 1997, 225–36.
- Krenkel, W. A. (ed.) *Marcus Terentius Varro. Saturae menippeae*. St. Katharinen, 2002.
- Kupreeva, I. "Qualities and Bodies: Alexander against the Stoics." *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 25 (2003): 297–344.
- Lefèvre, C. "'Quinta natura' et psychologie aristotélicienne." *Revue philosophique de Louvain* 69 (1971): 5–43.
- Lehmann, Y. *Varron théologien et philosophe romain*. Bruxelles, 1997.
- De Ley, H. *Macrobius and Numenius: A Study of Macrobius, In Somn., I, c.12. Latomus* 125. Brussels, 1972.
- Long, C. *The Twelve Gods of Greece and Rome*. Leiden, 1987.
- Luck, G. *Der Akademiker Antiochos*. Bern, 1953.
- Maass, E. *Orpheus: Untersuchungen zur griechischen, römischen, altchristlichen Jenseitsdichtung und Religion*. Munich, 1895.
- Mansfeld, J. "From Milky Way to Halo. Aristotle's *Meteorologica*, Aëtius, and Passages in Seneca and the Scholia on Aratus." In A.

- Brancacci (ed.) *Philosophy and Doxography in the Imperial Age*. Florence, 2005, 23–58.
- Mansfeld, J. Runia, D. T. *Aëtiana: The Method and Intellectual Context of a Doxographer, I: The Sources. (Philosophia Antiqua 73)*. Leiden, 1997.
- Mejer, J. *Diogenes Laertius and his Hellenistic Background*. Wiesbaden, 1978.
- Moraux, P. *Les listes anciennes des ouvrages d'Aristote*. Louvain, 1951.
- — —. "Quinta essentia." *RE* 24.1171–1263 (1963).
- Morrow, G. *Plato's Cretan City: A Historical Interpretation of the Laws*. Princeton, 1960.
- O'Meara, D. *Pythagoras Revived: Mathematics and Philosophy in Late Antiquity*. Oxford, 1990.
- Pettine, E. (ed., trad., comm.) *Plutarco, Il desiderio e l'afflizione sono affezioni del corpo o dell'anima? (De libidine et aegritudine)*. Salerno, 1991.
- Pines, S. "Un fragment de Seleucus de Seleucie en version arabe." In *The Collected Works of Schlomo Pines*. Vol. 2. Jerusalem–Leiden, 1986, 201–17.
- Pohlenz, M. "Praefatio." In M. Pohlenz and K. Ziegler (ed.) *Plutarchi moralia*. Vol. 6, fasc.3. Leipzig, 1953, 49–50.
- — —. "Praefatio." In W. R. Paton, I. Wegehaupt, M. Pohlenz (eds.) *Plutarchi Moralia*. Vol. 1. Leipzig, 1974, v–xliii.
- Radermacher, L. "Aus Lucians Lügensfreund." In *Festschrift Theodor Gomperz*. Wien, 1902, 197–207.
- Rawson, E. "The Life and Death of Asclepiades of Bithynia." *CQ* 32 (1982): 358–70.
- Reiche, H. A. T. "Heraclides' Three Soul-Gates: Plato Revised." *TAPA* 123 (1993): 161–77.
- Rohde, E. (1893) "Die Quellen des Iamblichus in seiner Biografie des Pythagoras." *RhM* 26 (1871): 554–76; 27 (1872): 23–61 = *Kl. Schr.* (Tüb. 1901) 2.102–72.
- — —. *Psyche: The Cult of Souls and Belief in Immortality among the Greeks*. Trans. from the 8th ed. by W. B. Hillis. 2 vols. New York, 1966.
- Schibli, H. "Hierocles of Alexandria and the Vehicle of the Soul." *Hermes* 121 (1993): 109–17.

- Scholten, C. *Antike Naturphilosophie und christliche Kosmologie in der Schrift "De opificio mundi" des Johannes Philoponos*. Berlin and New York, 1996.
- Schrader, H. "Heraclidea." *Philologus* 44 (1885): 236–61.
- Schütrumpf, E. (ed.) *Heraclides of Pontus: Texts and Translations*. (RUSCH XIV) New Brunswick and London, 2008.
- Sharples, R. W. "Dicaearchus on the Soul and on Divination." In W. W. Fortenbaugh and E. Schütrumpf (eds.) *Dicaearchus of Messana: Text, Translation and Discussion (RUSCH X) [Dicaearchus]*. New Brunswick and London, 2001. 143–73.
- Sollenberger, M. "The Lives of Peripatetics: An Analysis of the Contents and Structure of Diogenes Laertius' 'Vitae philosophorum' Book 5." *ANRW* 2 36.6 (1992): 3793–3879.
- Solmsen, F. "Eratosthenes as Platonist and Poet." *TAPA* 73 (1942): 192–213.
- Stockt, L. van der. "Plutarch's Use of Literature: Sources and Citations of *Quaestiones Romanae*." *Ancient Society* 18 (1987): 281–92.
- Untersteiner, M. (intro., ed., comm.) *Aristotele, Della Filosofia*. Rome, 1963.
- Valgiglio, E. "Varrone in Plutarco, II." *Atti cong. Studi varroniani*, (1976): 571–95.
- Vallance, J. T. *The Lost Theory of Asclepiades of Bithynia*. Oxford, 1990.
- Verdenius, W. J. "Parmenides' Conception of Light." *Mnemosyne* 4, ser. 2 (1949): 116–31.
- Voss, O. "De Heraclidis Pontici vita et scriptis." Rostock, Diss. 1896.
- Wehrli, F. *Die Schule des Aristoteles: Texte und Kommentar*. 2 Ausgabe, Hefte 1–10, Supplement bde 1–2. Basel, 1967–78.
- Westerink, L. G. (ed., trans., comm.) *Damascius, Lectures on the Philebus*. Amsterdam, 1959.
- . *The Greek Commentaries on Plato's Phaedo*. 2 vols., Amsterdam, Oxford, New York, 1976–77.
- Whittaker, J. "Varia Posidoniana." *Echos du Monde Classique* 40 n.s.16 (1997): 305–15.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. v. *Pindaros*. Berlin, 1922.
- . *Der Glaube der Hellenen*. 2 vols. 1931–32. 2nd ed. Darmstadt, 1955.
- Wüst, E. "Pluton." *RE* 21.1, 990–1026.

"Unjointed Masses": A Note on Heraclides' Physical Theory

Robert W. Sharples

Our evidence for Heraclides' physics is scanty in the extreme; any interpretation must be highly speculative. The present discussion will be no exception. It does not aim to break new ground, but rather to review existing scholarship as a contribution to making the essays collected in this volume a more complete commentary to the testimonia relating to Heraclides.¹

An issue that arises at the outset concerns the relation between Heraclides' physical theory and the theory of the structure of the human body adopted by the medical writer Asclepiades of Bithynia in the second century B.C.² Both are reported as having held a theory

¹ I am particularly grateful to Sylvia Berryman and to Liz Pender for comments which have helped me to improve the necessarily rather tortuous presentation of the arguments in this paper. The discussion by Svitzou (2005), which covers some of the same ground, only came to my attention after this paper was substantially complete, and I have unfortunately not been able to take it fully into account.

² On Asclepiades' date cf. Rawson 1982, 360–3 (arguing that he died before 91 BC), and, more speculatively, Polito 1999, arguing that he may have lived c.216–120 BC and may have studied in Alexandria.