When Aristotle said in the *Poetics* (chap. 9, 1451b10) that the business of history is the particular, *τί 'Αλκιβιάδης ἔπραξεν ἢ τί ἔπαθεν*, what Alcibiades did or suffered, he may well have had in mind these biographical developments of the historiography of the fourth century. As Professor Homeyer acutely suggested,[20] he may have had in mind particularly the excursus on Alcibiades in book 10 of Theopompus' *Philippica*. But this passage of the *Poetics* does not imply an approach to history in a strictly biographical sense —as if historiography were biography. It is one thing to say that history means what Alcibiades did or suffered; it is another thing to say that the business of the historian is to write the biography of Alcibiades. Even Thucydides, the least biographical of historians, could be analysed in terms of the actions he attributed to Cleon or to Nicias or to Alcibiades, though admittedly it would be a partial analysis. No one, however, could interpret Thucydides' history as being based on biography. I cannot read into Aristotle's words more than a criterion for differentiating history from tragedy. I would not conclude from his words that Aristotle did not make a distinction between history and biography.[21]

The real question is rather whether Aristotle had any clear idea of biography. This can pertinently be asked when we turn to Peripatetic biography. Before Aristotle, I would say that there were experiments of a biographical and autobiographical kind which normally were kept outside political historiography as transmitted to the fourth century in the models of Herodotus and Thucydides.

[20] *Klio* 41 (1963) 146.

[21] Cf. the discussion by R. Weil, *Aristote et l'histoire* (1960) 163–178. The Isocratean encomium was fashionable about 330–320 B.C., if it is true that Theodectes wrote about Alexander of Epirus and Philiscus about the contemporary Lycurgus (Olympiodorus, *in Plat. Gorg.* 515 c) according to this model.

IV From Aristotle to the Romans

I

The intellectual atmosphere of Athens changed after the Macedonian victory of 338 B.C. Macedonian rule meant the end both of Platonic mythmaking and of Isocratean rhetoric. There was no more experimentation on the borders between reality and fiction. The inventiveness which had characterized so much of Greek intellectual life in the first part of the fourth century was replaced by a new attitude of analysis and stock-taking. Plato was replaced by Aristotle, Isocrates by Demetrius of Phalerum. The world was becoming bigger every day owing to Alexander's conquests and the adventures of his immediate successors. But the intellectuals who had been left behind by Alexander were not in a mood of uncontrolled elation. Menander became the representative of Athenian society in the generation after Alexander: his characters, and Theophrastus' characters, are Greek, rather provincially so. Aristotle himself never recognized the empire built by his pupil as a form of political community worth studying. His search for facts to serve his philosophy was hellenocentric, sober, punctuated by that indefinable touch of irony and sadness which is the mark of Aristotelian genius. He had no use for the experiments in artistic, intuitive biography which had been a speciality of Plato and other Socratics. But it was not immediately obvious whether he and his pupils would replace the discarded forms of biography by new ones.

II

The general attitude of Aristotle and of his school towards historical research requires some definition. Aristotle had little sympathy with ordinary historiography, as he knew it. His words in chapter 9 of the *Poetics* are clear enough: "Poetry is something more scientific and serious than history, because poetry tends to give general truths, while history gives particular facts" (transl. W. Hamilton Fyfe). But chapter 23 of the same *Poetics* is less clear, and textual corruption has often been suspected. On any reading the passage is critical of historiography, "where what is required is an exposition not of a single piece of action, but of a single period of time, showing all that within the period befell one or more persons, events that have a merely casual relation to each other." D. M. Pippidi in a remarkable paper[1] tried to show that Aristotle made an exception for Thucydides in his condemnation of historians. One would like to believe Pippidi, but there is no evidence that Thucydides—whom Aristotle of course knew, yet never mentioned by name—was an exception for Aristotle.

What Aristotle's immediate pupils and continuators thought about history we simply do not know. Theophrastus commended Herodotus and Thucydides for their style. His opinion is reported by Cicero, *Orator* 12.39: "ab his historia commota est, ut auderet uberius quam superiores et ornatius dicere." This is not very helpful. The key to the attitude of the early Peripatetics to history was in the dialogue περὶ ἱστορίας by Praxiphanes: the key was lost with the dialogue itself. All we know of this dialogue is a mysterious sentence reported by Marcellinus, the biographer of Thucydides (chap. 29). According to Praxiphanes, Thucydides remained obscure as long as Archelaus (king of Macedon) lived, but became famous afterwards. The temptation to eliminate the word Archelaus is strong: Wilamowitz succumbed to it.[2] The sentence becomes innocently sensible after the operation: "Thucydides remained obscure as long as he lived, but after his death became famous." Innocence is no sign of authenticity: Archelaus must remain in Praxiphanes' fragment even if we no longer understand his presence. As the commentary by Poppo–Stahl observes in a sentence of general validity: "Praestat enim se nescientem fateri quam hariolari." All we learn from Marcellinus' text is that Thucydides played a part in Praxiphanes' dialogue. Perhaps he was chosen to represent history.[3]

What is less commonly observed, however, is that Aristotle did not merely express criticism of history as he knew it. He worked with all his forces, at least in the last years of his life, to overcome what he judged to be the shortcomings of ordinary historical writing. He tried to stimulate such historical research as he could accept as useful. He organized the collection of facts to answer precise questions: he replaced the narration of unrelated facts by a systematic analysis. He collected facts relating to culture and political institutions in order to give his own philosophy an empirical foundation. He took historical facts to be similar to natural facts and collected them in the same way under the same name of *historia*. A sophisticated example of how his mind worked is his application of historical research to deliberative eloquence. If a speaker wanted to give advice on war and peace, he had, according to a well-known passage in Aristotle's *Rhetorics* (1.4.1360a), to make an enquiry into the results of wars carried on not only by his own state, but also by others.

Aristotle's position can be compared with that of Bayle and Leibniz, who in the seventeenth century tried to overcome historical Pyrrhonism by a new type of historical research founded upon documents. Like Leibniz and Bayle, Aristotle turned to a pre-existing antiquarian tradition for help against contemporary historical writing. Literature on discoveries,

[1] *Mélanges J. Marouzeau* (Paris 1948) 483–490.
[2] *Hermes* 12 (1877) 353 = *Kl. Schriften* 3 (1969) 27.
[3] Cf. K. O. Brink, *Class. Quart.* 40 (1946) 11–26; W. Aly, *RE* XXII, 1776–1777; F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles* 9 (1957) p. 98 F 18; p. 112.

on the history of music, of philosophy, and of science existed before him. He himself perfected some of the pre-existing research, for instance on political institutions, on the customs of the barbarians, on the lists of game winners. Other subjects he left to his pupils. Theophrastus studied the history of systems of physics and metaphysics, Eudemus the history of mathematics and astronomy, Meno the history of medicine.

The question has therefore to be asked whether biography had a place of its own in the systematic search for historical facts which Aristotle organized to serve his own philosophy.[4]

Aristotle himself never wrote biographies, nor did any of his most illustrious pupils, such as Theophrastus. But this is not in itself a sufficient argument to exclude biography from the new Aristotelian approach to historical research. There is abundant evidence that the Peripatos took an interest in biography. The difficulties which surround that interest are more complex.

Paradoxically, the first difficulty is in the obvious delight which Aristotle and his pupils took in anecdotes. Anecdotes can be enjoyed in themselves or can be a part of an argument or ingredients of a biography. The nature of our evidence makes it very hard to decide what in each case is the function of the anecdotes in the works of Aristotle and his pupils.

The difficulty is less great in Aristotle because we have the complete texts of many of his works and can see his anecdotes in context. Readers of his *Athenaion Politeia* know that its anecdotes—such as that on Pisistratus and the Hymettus farmer—are told for their own sakes. They are not really part of an argument. The same can be said of many other biographical remarks and stories found in Aristotle's more theoretical works. My favourite example of the irrelevant

[4] See K. O. Brink, art. "Peripatos" in *RE* Suppl. 7, 899–949, and the Italian edition of E. Zeller, *La filosofia dei Greci* II, 6 (1966, appendices by A. Plebe). All the texts of the early Peripatetics in F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles*; vol. 10 (1st ed., 1959) includes an invaluable survey "Der Peripatos in vorchristlicher Zeit." On Clearchus cf. now L. Robert, *Comptes Rendus Acad. Inscript.*, 1968, 421–457.

anecdote in Aristotle is his characterization of Hippodamus of Miletus at the beginning of a lengthy discussion of Hippodamus' theories (*Politics* 2.1267b22). According to Aristotle, Hippodamus son of Euryphon was a Milesian, "who invented town planning and laid out Piraeus and had odd theories about other aspects of life which he liked to make himself known for: accounts of his foibles mention his long hair and expensive personal possessions and also the cheap but warm clothes he wore in summer as well as in winter, and his desire to be an expert in all the sciences." The cheap yet warm clothes that Hippodamus paraded not only in winter, but also in summer, can hardly have struck Aristotle as an argument against Hippodamus' political philosophy.

The works of Aristotle's pupils, with the exception of Theophrastus, are known to us only from chance quotations of later writers. When given an anecdote we are seldom in a position to decide whether it was part of an argument or of a biography.

Some facts, however, are indisputable. First, the Aristotelians were interested in anecdotes illustrating virtues and vices for use in their monographs on individual qualities: Heraclides Ponticus, for instance, wrote monographs on piety and justice. More specifically, the Peripatetics were interested in the difference between contemplative life, active life, and sensual life. The Greeks had always been sensitive to the variety of individual inclinations. As Archilochus had said: ἀλλ' ἄλλος ἄλλῳ καρδίην ἰαίνεται (frag. 41 Diehl), which Mr. J. M. Edmonds translates "but various are the things which cheer men's hearts." The Peripatetics brought order into this variety with their books περὶ βίων, the best known of which seem to have been by Clearchus and Dicaearchus.[5]

Secondly, the Aristotelians were interested in individual writers. Books περὶ Σαπφοῦς, περὶ Στησιχόρου, περὶ Πινδάρου, and so forth, are common in the bibliography of

[5] R. Joly, *Le thème philosophique des genres de vie dans l'antiquité classique* (1956) 128–139.

the Peripatos. But these books do not appear to have been biographies. As F. Leo was the first to see, they were historical interpretations of selected passages from one classical author.[6] No doubt they were full of references to true or imaginary details of the author's life. Thanks to Athenaeus, we can form at least some idea of the works about poets by the very fertile Chamaeleon, who seems to have belonged to the first generation of the Peripatos. Chamaeleon was prone to infer the personal circumstances of his poets from what they wrote. Thus poems by Sappho and Anacreon were used as evidence of their love affairs. Aeschylus was not only the first to introduce drunkards into tragedy, but wrote while under the influence of alcohol: a motto by Sophocles was quoted in confirmation. Corinthian customs were adduced to explain why Pindar mentioned *hetairai* in poems celebrating Corinthian winners. All this represented a contribution to the technique of biographical research which cannot be underrated either on the positive or on the negative side. Hellenistic *érudits* had little direct evidence for the lives of archaic, or even of classical, poets. The technique of extracting information about the lives of writers from their works was both a legitimate and an extremely dangerous substitute for direct information. It helped Hellenistic erudition out of an impasse, but it also opened the door to the most irresponsible exploitation of literary documents. What we must emphasize here is that even this enormous accumulation of biographical details in commentaries on poets does not necessarily imply the existence of full-fledged biographies. Didymus' work on Demosthenes, *περὶ Δημοσθένους*, a portion of which was recovered in a Berlin papyrus published by Diels and Schubart in 1904, is a later (first century B.C.) specimen of the same literary genre. It contains a great many biographical details

[6] With special clarity in "Didymos *Περὶ Δημοσθένους*," *Nachrichten Götting. Gesell.* 1904, 254–261 = *Ausgewählte Kleine Schriften* II (1960) 387–394. Cf. R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship* (1968) 146 n. 2: "... this genre was, so to speak, discovered by F. Leo in his review of Didymus." Leo himself emphasized that there were exceptions to his rule.

about Demosthenes, but of course it is no biography.[7] Even in the case of books with such titles as "About Illustrious Men," whose prototype was by Neanthes of Cyzicus (about 275 B.C.?), we remain in doubt whether they were a series of short biographies or a collection of anecdotes about illustrious men.

Thirdly, Peripatetic philosophers were interested in describing and evaluating the various philosophic schools. This involved them in collecting anecdotes about philosophers, but not necessarily in writing biographies. We are naturally inclined to think that Dicaearchus wrote biographies of philosophers because he certainly went into details of the lives of Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle. Besides, he wrote the celebrated "Life of Greece"; and we would expect him also to have written the lives of certain individuals of Greece. Yet no biography is quoted as coming from his pen. Diogenes Laertius (3.4) reports a detail about Plato as found *ἐν πρώτῳ περὶ βίων* by Dicaearchus, which would imply that this biographical detail belonged to a work on the different types of life. Works on the different philosophic schools were used in the struggles between the schools. The very purpose for which they were exploited makes one reluctant to conclude that they were biographical. Attacks on doctrinal tenets must have been freely mixed with attacks on individuals, in unknown proportion. Anecdotes served to characterize modes of life, of thought, of style. If Phainias or Phanias of Eresus in his book on the Socratics said that Aristippus was the first of the Socratics to pay for tuition and to make money by teaching (Diogenes Laertius 2.65), the story must have been meant to characterize, or perhaps to discredit, the hedonistic inclinations of Aristippus. Books of this type on philosophic schools, though probably first written in the Peripatos, soon became the common patrimony of Hellenistic culture. The Epicurean Idomeneus' book "On the Socratics" can

[7] P. Foucart, "Étude sur Didymos d'après un papyrus de Berlin," *Mém. Acad. Inscriptions,* 38, 1 (1909), is still the fundamental work.

hardly have been other than a hostile book against the Socratics, just as centuries later Philodemus wrote a hostile book against the Stoics with the anodyne title "On the Stoics."

Fourthly, and lastly, the Peripatetics had a part in producing the various types of collections of anecdotes which became a prominent feature of the Hellenistic and Latin literatures. Certain varieties of this erudition were current before Aristotle. Books on discoveries (*heuremata*) were written in the late fifth century and early fourth century.[8] Isocrates (*Panegyricus* 10) knew the genre in about 380 B.C. Anecdotes on strange events and personalities (*paradoxa, thaumasia*) were collected by Theopompus and perhaps by Ephorus. Collections of apt answers or remarks (*apophthegmata, gnomai, chreiai*) were another genre: as we have seen, Xenophon (*Hellenica* 2.3.56) knew that *apophthegmata* were unsuitable for insertion into a historical work. "Examples" (*paradeigmata*)—that is, memorable precedents to be quoted or copied when occasion arises—are as old as Homer (*Iliad* 5.381). The term *paradeigma* is known to the fourth-century author of the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* (1429a21)—Anaximenes?—as an ingredient of rhetoric. The second book of the *Oeconomica* attributed to Aristotle is specifically devoted to expedients in money matters. Later, in the first century B.C., Parthenius wrote an anthology of love stories. Collections of military stratagems fall into this category. Books of anecdotes on the deaths of illustrious men can be traced from the Peripatetic Phainias of Eresus to the *Exitus illustrium virorum* by Titinius Capito in the first century A.D. and even to Lactantius' *De mortibus persecutorum* in the fourth century. Indeed *exempla* became very popular among the Romans. Cornelius Nepos, Hyginus (Augustus' freedman), and Augustus himself made their collections. Valerius Maximus, who wrote under Tiberius,

[8] Cf. the admirable article by K. Thraede, "Erfinder," in *Reallex. für Antike und Christentum* 5 (1962), esp. 1191–1232. Add to the bibl. L. Cracco Ruggini, "Eforo nello Pseudo-Aristotele, *Oec.* II?" in *Athenaeum* 44 (1966) 199–237, 45 (1967) 3–88.

has survived with his *Facta et dicta memorabilia* to give us a precise idea of the genre.

In theory there should be no difficulty in recognizing the difference between any of these literary works and proper Hellenistic biographies. But in practice fragments are often insufficient to give us an indication of the exact nature of lost books. Mere titles can be even more misleading. Furthermore, genuine borderline cases disturb the neatness of the picture. Satyrus' life of Euripides has features in common with the above-mentioned commentaries (the so-called περὶ literature) of Chamaeleon and Didymus. Later Greek biographies, such as the anonymous life of the philosopher Secundus and Lucian's life of Demonax (second century A.D.), are mainly made up of sayings (*apophthegmata, chreiai*): biography is here the framework for a collection of pointed remarks and definitions. In all these cases the difficulty of seeing the dividing line between a collection of anecdotes and biography proper is doubled by the difficulty in determining the exact purpose of the biographical enquiry.

III

The circle of the undisputed biographers within the Peripatetic School is much more restricted. However, we must emphasize again and again that our ignorance may well mislead us in the evaluation of Peripatetic biography. St. Jerome offers a precise point of reference in the preface to his *De viris illustribus,* which must derive its information from Suetonius and which introduces as Suetonius' predecessors among the Greeks: "apud Graecos Hermippus Peripateticus, Antigonus Carystius, Satyrus doctus vir et omnium longe doctissimus Aristoxenus Musicus." Thus Aristoxenus, Hermippus, Antigonus of Carystus, and Satyrus are quoted as Greek biographers.

Three of the four names are connected with the Peripatetic School: Aristoxenus, Hermippus, and Satyrus; and therefore are enough to prove that the Peripatos had a leading

part in shaping Hellenistic biography. Only Antigonus of Carystus was clearly outside this school. Yet we must immediately remark that only one of the three Peripatetics, Aristoxenus of Tarentum, belongs to the first generation of Aristotle's pupils—and Aristoxenus was no conventional Aristotelian. We come nearer to the problems of the origins and of the limits of the influence of so-called Peripatetic biography if we take the origins and development of this extravagant man into consideration.

Aristoxenus of Tarentum, who must have been born about 370 B.C., had received a full training as a Pythagorean before he went over to the Peripatos in obscure circumstances. About 343 B.C. he had the opportunity to meet in Corinth Dionysius the Younger, then an exile from Syracuse, and to compare notes with him about Pythagorean behaviour. He learned from Dionysius the story of the Pythagorean friends Damon and Phintias which all of us in our school days had to translate either from the Greek of Diodorus and Iamblichus, from the Latin of Cicero or from the German of Schiller. By 322, on the death of Aristotle, Aristoxenus could consider himself qualified to succeed his master in the headship of the Peripatos, and he took offence when Theophrastus was preferred to him. It is doubtful whether he remained a Peripatetic after that. In any case he never concealed his sympathies for Pythagoras and his dislike of Plato. He even had something unpleasant to say about Aristotle as a man, if it is true that he insinuated that Aristotle built up his own school at a time when he was able to take advantage of Plato's absence. Plato he considered a plagiarist of Pythagoras.[9] Even his Socrates was, to say the least, unconventional: a man who could get very angry and did not mind turning an honest penny by lending money. Just because this is an unusual Socrates, we relish the picture and would like to be able to

[9] The evidence in the edition of Aristoxenus by F. Wehrli. O. Gigon, *Vita Aristotelis Marciana* (1962) 18, is more doubtful about Aristoxenus' attitude towards Plato.

agree with A. von Mess, who hailed Aristoxenus as the true biographer of Socrates.[10] But ancient philosophers were not supposed to get angry or to lend money; and it is difficult to escape the conclusion that Aristoxenus brought an element of malice into his picture of the Socratic schools. Aristoxenus made himself the biographer of Pythagoras and Archytas on the one side, and of Socrates and Plato on the other, to compare styles of life and tenets. He gives the impression of having had greater sympathy for his earlier than for his later masters, though on the whole he was far more respectful to Aristotle than he was to Plato. He accompanied his biography of Pythagoras with a study (probably in another book) of the Pythagorean style of life, a sensitive and discriminating description of a Pythagorean community.

Enough has been said to show that it would be far too simple to present Aristoxenus' biographies as the product of a conventional Aristotelian upbringing. They were a personal achievement inspired by his peculiar position between two schools: the Pythagorean school from which he had moved and the Peripatetic school of which he was an uneasy follower. He was a cosmopolite and presented Pythagoras as a man of Etruscan origins who went to learn wisdom from the Chaldaean Zoratas, that is Zarathustra. He was aware and proud of the fact that Pythagorean doctrines acquired followers among Lucanians, Messapians, Peucetians, and Romans.[11] Perhaps his belief that Pythagoras was an Etruscan had something to do with the popularity of Pythagoreanism in central Italy. We may even suspect that the Pythagorean tradition, with its strong emphasis on the personality and the example of the master, prepared Aristoxenus to become a biographer. But I do not think it wise to labour this point, because we know almost nothing about Pythagorean tradition before Aristoxenus. The sensitiveness to moral values and to human situa-

[10] *RhM* 71 (1916) 79.

[11] E. Gabba, in *Entretiens Fondation Hardt*, XIII: *Les origines de la république romaine* (1967) 157–163.

tions is very much Aristoxenus' own. In the conflict between different tenets and personalities, to none of which he owed complete allegiance, he developed his gift for observation and his capacity for unifying episodes within a biographical framework. He has the tone of a man who has seen too much to take a narrow view of human attitudes. In the story of Damon and Phintias the tyrant Dionysius is by no means the villain. In the description of the encounter between the austere Archytas and the voluptuous Polyarchus, which is preserved in Athenaeus, both protagonists are treated fairly: "Among the envoys sent by Dionysius the Younger to the city of Tarentum was Polyarchus, nicknamed the High-Liver, a man entirely devoted to physical pleasures, and this not merely in act, but also by his own confession. He was an acquaintance of Archytas and not an utter stranger to philosophic teachings; he frequented the temple-enclosures and would walk about with the other followers of Archytas, listening to the discussion . . ." (12.545, transl. C. B. Gulick).

Aristotle did not cross the bridge from anecdote to biography. Nor did Theophrastus, with all his attention to human character. Though other Peripatetics have claims worth considering in this connection, I think (basically in agreement with F. Leo, though for other reasons) that Aristoxenus is most likely to have been the first to write biography in the Peripatos. He must have picked up the loose threads of fifth-century biography, availed himself of the variety of biographical techniques displayed in the early fourth century, and appreciated the new trends of erudite research favoured by Aristotle. He was the man to produce a new blend: learned, yet worldly; attentive to ideas, yet gossipy. Perhaps he was also the first to make anecdotes an essential part of biography. We are so used to considering anecdotes the natural condiment of biography that we forget that just as there can be anecdotes without biography so there can be biography without anecdotes. I suspect that we owe to Aristoxenus the notion that a good biography is full of good anecdotes.

IV

If Aristoxenus was the first Peripatetic biographer, we may well ask ourselves whether his success was immediate—both inside and outside the Peripatos.

Now Clearchus wrote an encomium of Plato, and it has been suggested that Clearchus wanted to give an answer to the naughty things Aristoxenus had said about Plato. This is not impossible. But the title "encomium" connects the work of Clearchus with Speusippus' encomium of Plato (Diogenes Laertius 4.5), and Speusippus in turn seems to have imitated Isocrates' encomium of Euagoras. Certainly Clearchus followed Speusippus in making Plato the son of Apollo (Diogenes Laertius 3.2). Clearchus' encomium of Plato therefore seems to have belonged to an older type of biographical writing. Even if Clearchus wrote with polemical intent against Aristoxenus, his encomium of Plato and Aristoxenus' life of Plato were probably not biographies of the same type.

Demetrius of Phalerum is a much more difficult case. Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*De Demosthene* 53) seems to state that he wrote a biography of Demosthenes, but he is not supported by the other evidence. It is more probable that Demetrius discussed episodes of Demosthenes' life in his books on rhetoric. Diogenes Laertius (5.81) mentions a book *Socrates* by Demetrius and quotes three times from an "Apology of Socrates" by the same Demetrius. Plutarch (*Aristides* 1 and 27) quotes biographical details from the book *Socrates*. It is probable that *Socrates* and the "Apology of Socrates" were the same work. But it is not clear whether this work was a biography. If it was, it might have been an answer to Aristoxenus.

Another name to be considered among those who may have been influenced by Aristoxenus is Phainias (or Phanias) of Eresus. He was a pupil of Aristotle and a special friend of Theophrastus; and he is described by Plutarch (*Themistocles* 13) as a philosopher not unversed in historical writing. One of his historical works was a direct development of a suggestion

in Aristotle's *Politics* (1311a25): he wrote on the elimination of tyrants as a consequence of revenge. Tyrannies seem to have attracted him. He also wrote a monograph "On the Sicilian Tyrants." His works included monographs on the Socratics and on the prytanes of his native town Eresus. The fragments show the typical Peripatetic interest in details, but it is uncertain whether any of the works so far mentioned was biographical. If the work on the tyrants of Sicily was modelled on Theopompus' excursus on the demagogues, it was probably anecdotal rather than strictly biographical. Plutarch says, however, that some of his biographical details on Solon and Themistocles are derived from Phainias. These present a real problem. The details about Solon are perhaps not very impressive, but those about Themistocles have rightly attracted attention as fine specimens of biographical style. The famous scene of the arrival of Themistocles at the Persian court is explicitly attributed to Phainias by Plutarch. L. Bodin[12] and R. Laqueur[13] assumed that Phainias wrote a full biography of Themistocles and proceeded on this assumption to a reconstruction of Phainias' biographical work. The very assumption from which they started is of course doubtful. Neither Plutarch nor anybody else tells us that Phainias wrote a biography of Themistocles—or of Solon. The episodes that Plutarch reports are excellent samples of what a biography might be, but these samples may have belonged to a collection of anecdotes. In other words, we are faced again by what I feel to be a major difficulty in studying Peripatetic biography, namely the difficulty of separating anecdotes from biography. In the present state of our knowledge it would be absurd to deny altogether that Phainias wrote biographies; but it is a waste of time to try to guess what sort of biography Phainias may have written, since we cannot be certain that there even was biography by Phainias.

What emerges from our enquiry is a confirmation of our

[12] *Rev. Ét. Grecques* 28–30 (1915–1917).
[13] *RE* s.v. "Phainias."

hypothesis that, unless Dicaearchus' περὶ βίων was a collection of biographies, Aristoxenus had no rival as a biographer in the first generation of the Peripatos. Extensive practice of learned biography, both inside and outside the Peripatos, we find only in the second or third generation after Aristotle. The three names of Hermippus, Satyrus, and Antigonus of Carystus quoted by St. Jerome belong to the second part of the third century B.C. Both Hermippus and Satyrus are called Peripatetics. In some sense they must have been followers of Aristotle. What we know of Hermippus at any rate would rather make him a pupil of Callimachus and an exploiter of the materials collected by him. No doubt Callimachus' *Pinakes* may ultimately have been inspired by the methods of cataloguing Aristotle's library: at least Strabo (13.608) states that the organization of the library of Alexandria imitated that of Aristotle's. But Callimachus is not the man to be reduced to the role of a pupil of Aristotle.[14]

Hermippus, who was born in Smyrna, lived in Alexandria about 200 B.C. He used Callimachus' files for his biographies, including archaic legislators, the Seven Wise Men, Pythagoras, Gorgias, Isocrates, Aristotle, and their respective pupils. His interest in the frivolous, the morbid (death scenes), the paradoxical is well established: he went all out to captivate his readers by learned sensationalism. (Compare also the summaries by Heraclides Lembus in *POxy* XI 1367). He continued the Peripatetic practice of grouping men of the same profession in the same book. The lawgivers were included in at least six books, the Seven Wise Men in at least four books of his biographies.[15] He was careful to indicate school affiliations (Dionysius Halicarnassensis *De Isaeo* 1.1). He accepted what must have been a suggestion from an earlier (Peripatetic or

[14] O. Regenbogen, *RE* s.v. "Pinax"; R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, 127–134.
[15] F. E. Adcock, *Cambridge Histor. Journ.* 2 (1927) 106 on Hermippus and the lawgivers. I. Düring, *Class. et Mediaev.* 17 (1956) 11; A.-H. Chroust, *Rev. Ét. Grecques* 77 (1964) 53; R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, 129, with other bibl. On Neanthes' priority, R. Laqueur, *RE* s.v. "Neanthes."

Jewish?) scholar that Pythagoras had imported Jewish thought into Greece: Flavius Josephus was of course pleased with that admission (*Contra Apionem* 1.22.163).

Satyrus was probably born later than Hermippus, if he is identical with the author of a book on the demes of Alexandria which presupposes the reforms of Ptolemy IV at the end of the third century. The recent publication of a new fragment of this work has not thrown any new light on its date and authorship (*POxy* XXVII 2465). On the other hand, Satyrus the biographer is certain to have lived before Ptolemy VI (about 150 B.C.), because Heraclides Lembus who lived under Ptolemy VI made an epitome not only of Hermippus' but also of Satyrus' biographies. It was a surprise to discover from Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 1176, which was published in 1912, that Satyrus wrote biographies in the form of a dialogue. Biographies in dialogue form were previously known only from late antiquity, in Sulpicius Severus, Palladius, and Gregory the Great's life of St. Benedict. Aristotle's dialogue on poets is not quite a precedent for Satyrus. Nor is Cicero's *Brutus* entirely comparable, though F. Leo declared it to be the nearest analogue to Satyrus' work.[16] Satyrus undoubtedly intended to write biographies. The subscription of Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 1176 reads: "Book Six of the catalogue (?) of the lives of Satyrus including Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides." This must be said, because A. Dihle reports a suggestion by K. Latte that Satyrus' life of Euripides belonged to the literature on *problemata*: it was not true biography. The text of the papyrus, with its clear transition from a section dealing with the life to a section dealing with the death of the poet, seems to make the biographical intention unmistakable. Satyrus deduced many of his biographical details about Euripides from the text of Euripides' tragedies. This was good Peripatetic method, as we have seen. He also reflects the

[16] *Ausgewählte Kleine Schriften* II 368. Cicero may, however, have written in dialogue form his eulogy of the younger Cato: the strange statement of *Schol. Iuven.* 6, 338 p. 95 Wessner is well defended by C. P. Jones in a forthcoming article [*RhM* 113 (1970) 188–196].

interests of the school in literary history by linking the new comedy of Menander with Euripides.

The third man mentioned by St. Jerome, Antigonus of Carystus, had nothing to do with the Peripatos. He lived in the middle of the third century B.C., if he can be identified with the courtier of Attalus I, king of Pergamum. His profession was that of a bronze founder, and his literary activity was amateurish. In his youth he had been a pupil of the philosopher Menedemus, the originator of the Eretrian school. He imitated Aristoxenus in writing about philosophers either of the previous generation or of his own time: the Sceptics Pyrrho and Timon, the Academics Polemo, Crates, Crantor, and Arcesilaus, the Peripatetic Lyco; Menedemus, and finally Zeno of Citium, who died in 263. It would be optimistic to say, even after Wilamowitz' feat of reconstruction, that we know what Antigonus intended—if he intended anything.[17] He certainly showed curiosity and was very good at describing personal appearances. He drew a striking portrait of his master Menedemus, whose dinner parties were proverbially frugal.

We can add other names to those given by St. Jerome. One is Aristo of Ceos, probably the head of the Peripatos in the last part of the third century. He wrote on Heraclitus, Socrates, and Epicurus; and at least his book on Epicurus is explicitly called a life by Diogenes Laertius 10.14. The other is Sotion, who lived at Alexandria about 180 B.C. and wrote on the "Succession of Philosophers": a book which is assumed to have strongly influenced the organization of Diogenes Laertius' "Lives of Philosophers." I am not aware that Sotion had Peripatetic affiliations. Like Hermippus he seems to have exploited the files of Callimachus' *Pinakes*.

Three biographers of the Peripatetic school—Hermippus, Satyrus, and Aristo—face two biographers (Antigonus of Carystus and Sotion) who did not belong to the Peripatos. Of the three Peripatetics only one, Aristo, played an important

[17] Cf. O. Gigon in *Lexikon der Alten Welt*, s.v. "Biographie."

part in the school: he is also the least important as a biographer. As for Hermippus, we hardly know why he was called a Peripatetic. The connection between the Peripatos and biography is not so permanent and so close as we are often told, even if we confine ourselves to biographies of philosophers, artists, sages, and poets. If we agree to consider Aristoxenus, the dubious Aristotelian, the master of Peripatetic biography, we are obliged to conclude that there was a gap of at least one generation before his teaching produced pupils—and these pupils were by no means all members of the Peripatos.

The picture becomes even more blurred if we look at other aspects of biographical and autobiographical literature of the Hellenistic period.

We have seen that the type of biographical encomium created by Isocrates continued to be popular. Theopompus' encomia of Philip and Alexander of Macedon belong to this genre: so does Callisthenes' encomium of Hermias. If Clearchus expanded the encomium to cover the life of Plato, others undoubtedly developed it to cover the lives of generals and statesmen. Some encomia must have been very similar to political history, though the two were never confused. Polybius, who himself wrote an encomium of Philopoemen in three books, stated what one would expect to find in an encomium of this kind: "explaining who he and his family were and the nature of his training when young . . . enumerating his most famous actions." An encomium—Polybius went on—"demanded a summary and somewhat exaggerated account of his achievements" (10.21 = *FGrHist* 173). An extensive account of the period of education had to be followed by a selective report of political and military achievements. Ordinary history would hardly give space to the youth of a future general and would report diplomatic moves and military operations much more fully. This explains why many books on great men had a reference to education in their titles. Onesicritus' "How Alexander Was Educated" (ὡς Ἀλέξανδρος ἤχθη) is paralleled by the "Education of

Alexander" (Ἀλεξάνδρου ἀγωγή) by Marsyas of Pella, who had been one of Alexander's companions. In the third century a Lysimachus wrote περὶ τῆς Ἀττάλου παιδείας, "About the Education of Attalus I." Thus L. Pearson was wrong in suggesting that the title of Onesicritus' book should be emended from ὡς Ἀλέξανδρος ἤχθη to ὡς Ἀλέξανδρος ἀνήχθη, "How Alexander Marched On."[18]

The gap between this type of historical encomium and a full biography of a king or of a general is so narrow that any neat separation is impossible. Satyrus himself wrote on Philip II and Dionysius the Younger of Syracuse; Neanthes the Younger (about 200 B.C.) wrote on Attalus I; Asclepiades Areiou on Demetrius of Phalerum; Timochares on one Antiochus, perhaps Epiphanes or Sidetes, (*FGrHist* 165). Sosylus notoriously wrote about Hannibal, a certain Posidonius on Perseus of Macedon (*FGrHist* 169). How far were these biographies inspired by the Peripatos? How clearly can we distinguish between such biographies and the books which meant to tell political history in the form of a monograph about an individual king? The memorialists of Alexander's wars—Clitarchus, Ptolemy, and Aristobulus—the historians of the Diadochoi and of the Hellenistic kings (such as Timaeus on Pyrrhus, Demetrius of Byzantium on Antiochus Soter and on Ptolemy Philadelphus) are in this ambiguous position between biography and history. Surely it is impossible to try to enforce a rigid separation of biography from the monograph centred on one man. As Richard Reitzenstein showed in famous pages of his *Hellenistische Wundererzählungen* (1906), the theory of historiography contained in Cicero's letter to Lucceius (*ad familiares* 5.12) applies both to the biography and to the monograph centred on one man ("Si uno in argumento unaque in persona mens tua tota versabitur"). There is no reason to believe that Cicero repeated Peripatetic theory in this letter. But, even if he did, the biographical practice which such a letter presupposes—

[18] *The Lost Histories of Alexander the Great* (1960) 89–90.

monographs on kings, generals, politicians—cannot be connected exclusively with Peripatetic circles. Satyrus is clearly the exception, not the rule, as a Peripatetic biographer of kings.[19]

The evidence so far available seems to justify the conclusion that Hellenistic biography is to be considered a Peripatetic speciality only in a limited sense. The great Aristotelian conception of a systematic exploration of the empirical world had not survived the first generation of the pupils. Biography soon ceased to have a specific function within the Peripatos. It remained closely connected with philology because questions of authenticity and interpretation of texts were inextricably connected with biography. It was also used by philosophers at large as a weapon against hostile schools. But more often biography provided entertainment for educated people who liked to know something about the lives of poets, philosophers, and kings. The type of life we call Peripatetic is the result of a sort of compromise. The basic interest in discovering a variety of human characters had a philosophic root, but the wealth of strange details, of piquant anecdotes, was ultimately meant to satisfy the curiosity of the common reader.

The extent and importance of Greek biographical literature of the second and first centuries B.C. is a matter for speculation. An example will show the inadequacy of our information. We should never have known that Eratosthenes wrote a book entitled *Arsinoe* if it had not been quoted once by Athenaeus 276a–c (*FGrHist* 241F16). The quotation shows beyond doubt that in about 215 B.C. Eratosthenes reported details of the life of Arsinoe III Philopator from personal knowledge.

[19] Another theory, in *Auctor ad Herennium* 1.8.13 and Cicero *De inventione* 1.19.27, makes a distinction between two kinds of narrative, one based on "negotia" (legendary, historical, and imaginary), the other on "personae." R. Reitzenstein, *Hellenistische Wundererzählungen* (1906) 94; K. Kerényi, *Die griechisch-orientalische Romanliteratur* (1927, 2nd ed. 1962) 2; S. Trenkner, *The Greek Novella in the Classical Period* (1958) 183, have taken the narrative based on "personae" to refer to, or at least to include, the novel. But these passages are not clear to me. Cf. also K. Barwick, *Hermes* 63 (1928) 261; F. Pfister, *Hermes* 68 (1933) 457.

He tells us that one day he was accompanying the queen when she met a crowd celebrating a Dionysiac festival and that she expressed disgust at it. As her husband, Ptolemy IV Philopator, was a great supporter of Dionysiac festivals, the story has its point. Perhaps there is a link between Eratosthenes' book on Arsinoe and the book of stories about her husband by Ptolemy son of Hegesarchus of Megalopolis, which gave much space to the king's devotion to Dionysus (*FGrHist* 161F2). But the exact nature of the book *Arsinoe* is unknown: it may have been a biography; more probably it was a learned discussion with a biographical, or perhaps rather autobiographical, background.

If the discovery of the Satyrus papyrus on Euripides glaringly exposed the lacunae of our information about Hellenistic biography, a more recent discovery underlined even more sharply the extent of our ignorance. *Papyrus Graeca Hauniensis* 6, published by T. Larsen in 1942, seems to contain short biographies of third century B.C. Ptolemies within the framework of a genealogical tree. Mario Segre—in a paper he had meant to be provisional, but which death in a Nazi camp made final—tried to prove that the author was under the influence of the Roman *imagines maiorum*. His theory is not convincing, but no better interpretation of the unusual text has yet been offered. Though the papyrus was written in the second century A.D., the text itself seems to be Hellenistic. It may provide (if it is a combination of genealogy with biography) the closest analogy I can think of to the *Ordo generis Cassiodororum* which the great Cassiodorus composed in the sixth century A.D.[20]

[20] M. Segre, "Una genealogia dei Tolemei e le imagines maiorum dei Romani," *Rend. Acc. Pontif. Archeol.* 19 (1942–1943) 269–280. Cf. A. Momigliano, *Class. Quart.* 44 (1950) 107–116; W. Steidle, *Sueton und die antike Biographie* (1951) 177; É. Will, *Histoire politique du monde hellénistique* I (1966) 211. The comparison with Cassiodorus is already in Segre. Cassiodorus' genealogical text, known to us from excerpts, was first edited by H. Usener under the title of *Anecdoton Holderi* (Bonn 1877). It was reprinted by Mommsen in his edition of *Cassiodori Variae*, p. v (*Mon. Germ. Hist., Auct. Antiquissimi* XII [1894]). More recent bibliography in my *Studies in Historiography* (1966) 205.

It would be splendid if we were able to resolve our doubts about the nature of Peripatetic biography by turning to a contemporary of the Emperor Augustus, Nicolaus of Damascus.[21] He was brought up as an Aristotelian and wrote an autobiography and a life of Augustus, of both of which we have unusually extensive fragments. At first sight, Nicolaus seems ideally suited to tell us what Peripatetic biography was like. Indeed his fragments show clear signs of his school allegiance: he describes both his own qualities and those of Augustus according to Aristotle's ethics. But his Aristotelianism is superficial. He is bent on writing a panegyric both of himself and of Augustus—and he is in many other ways remote from the scholarly habits of the Aristotelians. What is not encomiastic in his works is a straightforward account of political and social events in which I do not see anything specifically Aristotelian. His life of Augustus is the best preserved example of a biography of a king in the Hellenistic tradition. Clearly it depends to a large extent on Augustus' own autobiography, but Nicolaus interprets the data according to his own taste. The result, as far as we can judge, is a dynastic biography, its main emphasis on the devotion of Octavian to the memory of his adoptive father, Caesar. Plutarch may owe something of his biographical technique to Nicolaus.

It is virtually certain that not only the "Plutarchian" (chronologically ordered) but also the "Suetonian" (systematically ordered) type of biography existed in the Hellenistic period. Among "Suetonian" biographies, the abridged *Vita* of Sophocles, for instance, does not quote any authority later than the second century B.C. The *Vita Marciana* of

[21] Text with a fundamental commentary in Jacoby, *FGrHist* 90. A controversial interpretation by R. Laqueur in *RE* XVII, 1 (1936) 362–424. Cf. B. Z. Wacholder, *Nicolaus of Damascus* (1962), which tries to establish connections between Nicolaus' autobiography and Jewish writings. He has not convinced me, and I am doubtful about the analysis of Nicolaus' life of Augustus by W. Steidle, *Sueton und die antike Biographie* (1951) 133–140.

Aristotle—provided some patent accretions are eliminated (polemics against Aelius Aristides)—is likely to represent the substance of the biography Andronicus wrote about 70 B.C. to introduce his epoch-making edition of Aristotle. The recently discovered life of Pindar in a papyrus (*POxy* 2438) of the second century A.D. gives the impression of being an unadulterated summary of Hellenistic research. Even the composite biography of Thucydides which goes under the name of Marcellinus, though in its present form not earlier than the fifth century A.D., preserves the learned discussion which was going on at the time of Didymus (first century B.C.) about the mysterious family connections and about the equally mysterious death of the Athenian historian. These are random examples of "Suetonian" biographies, the substance of which must go back to Alexandrian erudition. But it is well to remind ourselves that none of the surviving "Suetonian" biographies (in their present form) belongs to the period before Augustus.

Furthermore, the evidence of the surviving texts is not sufficient to indicate when and how the diversification in the two types of biography took place. The name which F. Leo connected with the creation of the "Suetonian" biography (Heraclides Lembus in the second century B.C.) is not supported by any substantial proof. Indeed, we must doubt Leo's doctrine that the "Suetonian" scheme was originally reserved for biographies of literary and artistic personalities and was first applied to the emperors precisely by Suetonius. The Suetonian scheme is only a refinement of the systematic order of certain "encomia" of kings and generals. Two of the nonliterary biographies of Cornelius Nepos are nearer to the Suetonian than to the Plutarchian type (Epaminondas, Iphicrates). On the other hand, the literary biographies of the Ten Orators wrongly attributed to Plutarch can be forced into the Suetonian scheme only with considerable difficulty. The Suetonian type was better suited to the lives of writers and artists, as it allowed a systematic analysis of their personal

qualities and of their works. But we have no reason to believe that it was ever restricted to the nonpolitical biography.[22]

Future research or perhaps future discoveries of texts will solve the problem of the origins of the Suetonian biography: at the moment a confession of ignorance is not out of place.

In any case we must not assume any great uniformity in Hellenistic biographies. Lives of poets could not be constructed like lives of philosophers; and lives of generals and kings were different from either. To write about men who had lived long ago was not the same thing as writing about contemporaries. Poets of the past had left few authentic memories. The fragments of the monument erected to Archilochus in his native Paros give us an idea of how Hellenistic scholars managed to build up biographies on the basis of inferences from poems, information from older chronicles, oral tradition, and imagination. The relation between poetry and life was in itself a problem which exercised ingenuity and encouraged perversity in the handling of the literary evidence. Philosophers had left behind disciples whose opinions had to be taken into account. Kings and generals had left their traces in general history; this was bound to affect their biographies.

More work must be done on this subject. Much can be learned from later biographies which used Hellenistic models. But the dangers of making inferences from later texts are obvious. Though, for instance, we know that Iamblichus directly or indirectly used Aristoxenus for his life of Pythagoras, Iamblichus' own neo-Platonic atmosphere is all-

[22] On "Suetonian" biography see F. Leo, *Griechisch-römische Biographie*, esp. 118–135 (the part he attributes to Heraclides Lembus on p. 135 is not clear to me); what Wilamowitz wrote in *Antigonos von Karystos* (1881) 88 is altogether different. Cf. A. Rostagni, *Suetonius De Poetis* (1944) XII–XXIV. For a critical evaluation of Leo's theory, W. Steidle, *Sueton und die antike Biographie*, 126–177, is particularly important. Cf. also G. Arrighetti, *Satiro, Vita di Euripide* (1964) 5–21. On Marcellinus see Bux, *RE* XIV 1450–1487. On Pindar's biography (*POxy* XXVI 2438), E. G. Turner, *Greek Papyri* (1968) 104–106, and G. Arrighetti, *Studi Class. Orient.* 16 (1967) 129–148 (who quotes Turner). The *Vita Marciana* of Aristotle is admirably edited by O. Gigon, Berlin 1962. H. Bloch, *Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.* 71 (1940) 27–39, showed how unoriginal Heraclides Lembus was.

pervasive: it does not allow safe conclusions about Aristoxenus.

V

At this stage I need hardly refute the opinion, made authoritative by F. Leo and Wilamowitz, that autobiography was unknown to the Greeks.[23] The evidence for autobiographical writing in the fifth and fourth centuries has been previously considered. The fourth-century tradition of writing apologetic pamphlets to defend oneself remained alive under Alexander and afterwards. It is difficult to decide whether Demades' apology was a forgery, as Jacoby maintains (*FGrHist* II D, p. 641). The orator Lycurgus' *Apologismos* was certainly authentic, just as Demetrius of Phalerum's apology for his ten years of rule was authentic. Some kings wrote their memoirs. We know that *Hypomnemata* are attributed to Pyrrhus (*FGrHist* 229). What Pausanias wrote in 1.12.2 seems to me to refer to these memoirs, *pace* Jacoby (*FGrHist* 159T1). "There are books written by men of no renown as historians, entitled 'Memoirs.' When I read these I marvelled greatly both at the personal bravery of Pyrrhus in battle, and also at the forethought he displayed whenever a contest was imminent" (transl. W. H. S. Jones). Later, Aratus wrote an autobiography in many books which—to judge from Polybius and Plutarch, who used them—must have been a fairly full account of military and diplomatic events (*FGrHist* 231).

Of course, not all the historical *Hypomnemata* we meet in the Hellenistic world can be treated as personal memoirs. Some were *Ephemerides*; that is, court or business diaries of kings and their employees, which were used by later histori-

[23] Wilamowitz, *Intern. Wochenschrift* 1907, 1105; F. Leo, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* I (1913) 342. As E. Fraenkel wrote to me (24 Feb. 1968), Leo "had not forgotten Aratos and the other Greek writers of autobiography, but, as it sometimes happened to him, he drew perhaps too sharp a dividing line between what he regarded as different literary γένη."

ans.[24] I leave aside Alexander's *Ephemerides*, which have recently come under fire.[25]

A journal of the Ptolemies is mentioned in Aristeas' letter (298). The journal of the Macedonian kings is mentioned by Polyaenus (*Stratagems* 4.6.2) and less clearly by Polybius (18.33.3). At least one ancient reader found this journal delightful, like an authentic book of personal recollections. Lucian, if he is the author of the *Praise of Demosthenes*, wrote (26): "I once read the memoirs of the Macedonian royal family which gave me such delight at the time that I made a special point of acquiring the book. Now I've just remembered I have it at home. In addition to giving details of Antipater's activities at home, it describes his dealings with Demosthenes, which I think you'd be specially interested in hearing" (transl. M. D. MacLeod). It is clear from this that the difference between a book of personal recollections—a real autobiography—and an official diary was not always profound.

There can be no doubt about the private, almost intimate, character of the *Hypomnemata* by Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II in twenty-four books (*FGrHist* 234). Athenaeus read these memoirs, and the extracts he produced do not necessarily reflect the most serious interests of the king who had the distinction of having been taught by Aristarchus. There are details of how Egyptian soldiers picked artichokes and offered them to the king after having stripped off the prickles (2.71). There is an excerpt from the description of the royal zoo of Alexandria, from which it is evident (as Athenaeus remarks, 14.654) that the most illustrious king had never so much as

[24] For the various meanings of *hypomnema*, F. Bömer, "Der Commentarius," *Hermes* 81 (1953) 210–250; E. G. Turner, *Greek Papyri* (1968) 112–124; R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, 29, 224f. On the difference between *hypomnemata* and highly finished literary compositions, see Arrian in Epictetus *Praef.* 2, Lucian *De conscr. hist.* 16 and 48. On *hypomnemata* as sources of history, Polyb. 12.25e. The pioneer work was done by U. Wilcken, *Philologus* 53 (1894) 80–126.

[25] A. E. Samuel, *Historia* 14 (1965) 1–12, on a possible Babylonian model for the record of Alexander's last days.

tasted a pheasant, "but if he had seen that each one of us today has a whole pheasant served to us besides the food already consumed, he would have filled up another book to add to the famous stories in his commentaries now consisting of twenty-four books." Ptolemy VIII gave the names of the mistresses of his great ancestor Ptolemy Philadelphus (13.576e). He reported the question that his neighbour Masinissa, the king of Mauretania, had asked the men who liked pet animals: "In your country, gentlemen, do not the women bear children?" (12.518). And finally we have from him the famous description of how young Antiochus IV Epiphanes, his contemporary, behaved when he was a hostage in Rome (10.438d).[26]

We must assume that Nicolaus Damascenus' autobiography, though written under Augustus, was in the Hellenistic tradition. Its extensive fragments present a peculiar combination of a factual account with an apologetic self-portrait. As we have said, he tried to show that he lived according to Peripatetic ethics. On the other hand, he provided a great deal of information on political events, presumably to confirm and supplement his biography of Augustus and to correct the memoirs of Herodes, which he had previously helped to write.

The autobiographical letter, too, must have survived in the Hellenistic period. Apart from Timonidas' letter to Speusippus on the expedition of Dio to Syracuse, we know of Alexander's letters to his mother, which included, for instance, information about his expedition to India (Arrian 6.1.4). We also hear of letters by Antipater (Cicero *De officiis* 2.14.48) and the first Ptolemy (Lucian *Pro lapsu* 10). Perhaps the Macedonians took a liking to this genre. If Scipio Africanus Major, the great philhellenist, wrote an autobiographical letter to Philip of Macedon about his own military exploits in

[26] W. Otto and H. Bengtson, "Zur Geschichte des Niederganges des Ptolemäerreiches," *Abhandl. Bayer. Akad.* 17 (1938), give the historical background. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, 212.

Spain (Polybius 10.9.3), he was obviously continuing a Hellenistic tradition, however little we know about it. It was the literary device still used centuries later by the Emperor Julian in his letter to the Boulé and the Demos of Athens.

I shall not discuss whether the memoirs of Aesop are a Roman or a Hellenistic forgery; they are mentioned by the *Suda* (s.v. *Αἴσωπος Σάμιος*). Nor shall I dwell on that interesting variety of autobiography, the autobiography of gods. Diodorus knows that at Nysa in Arabia there were short autobiographies of Isis and Osiris (1.27.3). These were aretalogies of the type actually found in extant inscriptions (Kaibel, *Epigrammata Graeca* 1028; *IG* XII 5.1.739).[27] Lactantius states that Euhemerus had been able to see with his own eyes in the temple of Jupiter Triphylius the autobiography of Jupiter himself: "in qua columna sua gesta perscripsit, ut monumentum posteris esset rerum suarum" (*Divinae Institutiones* 1.11.33).[28]

Gods do what kings do. There must be a link between Jupiter's *res gestae*, which Euhemerus claimed to have seen, and Augustus' *res gestae*. Autobiographical royal inscriptions were not absent in the Hellenistic age: compare for instance the inscription of Ptolemy Euergetes I, the text of which is preserved by Cosmas Indicopleustes (*OGIS* 54), and those of Antiochus I of Commagene (*OGIS* 383). Augustus' *res gestae*, however, cannot be one-sidedly traced back to Hellenistic models. There is a Roman component in the *res gestae* which goes back to Roman triumphal inscriptions. The Hellenistic precedents, such as they are, of the *res gestae* were given new validity by Wilamowitz when he called attention as early as in 1886 to the similarity between the *res gestae* of Augustus and the inscription set up by Hadrian in Athens which is summarized by Pausanias 1.5.5.[29] Hadrian must have followed

[27] D. Müller, *Aegypten und die griech. Isis-Aretalogien* (1961).

[28] F. Jacoby, *RE* VI 963.

[29] Wilamowitz, *Hermes* 21 (1886) 623–627, partially criticized by Mommsen, *Hist. Zeitschrift* 57 (1887) 385–397 = *Ges. Schriften* IV 247–258. W. Steidle, *Sueton und die antike Biographie*, 178–184, gives more recent literature.

Hellenistic, rather than Roman, models for his inscription. More remote pre-Hellenistic (oriental) models need not concern us here.

As F. Jacoby said (*FGrHist* II D pp. 639–640), there is no parallel in the Greek and Hellenistic worlds to the abundance of *Commentarii de vita sua* written by Romans during the Republic and the Empire, including the emperors themselves from Caesar to Septimius Severus. Jacoby, however, implicitly rebuking Leo and Wilamowitz, added that autobiography was a characteristic, but not an independent, product of the Romans. The confirmation of this is that the Romans felt free to write autobiographical letters to Greeks and Macedonians. Another Scipio, P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica, wrote to a Hellenistic king, explaining the war against Perseus (Plutarch *Aemilius Paulus* 15). Then the Romans began to write autobiographical letters to other Romans. Gaius Gracchus wrote a letter or *hypomnema* to M. Pomponius about his father, his brother, and presumably himself which contained the famous account of Tiberius' journey through Etruria (Plutarch *Tiberius Gracchus* 8).[30] Q. Lutatius Catulus prepared a commentary on his consulate of 102 and his proconsulate of 101 B.C., during which he and Marius had defeated the Cimbri at Vercellae. He sent it to his friend, the poet A. Furius, perhaps to have it turned into poetry. Not by chance, Cicero observed that it was written "molli et Xenophonteo genere sermonis"(*Brutus* 35.132).[31] We are in a Greek tradition. On the other hand, Aratus' autobiography was probably the predecessor of the memoirs of P. Rutilius Rufus consul 105 B.C. and of M. Aemilius Scaurus consul 115 B.C. About the latter, Cicero sadly remarked: "Sane utiles, quos nemo legit" (*Brutus* 29.112). Sulla's *res gestae*, the only one of these

[30] On the literary genre and the contents of Gaius Gracchus' work we are not sufficiently informed: cf. H. Peter, *Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae* I (2nd ed. 1914, reprint 1967), p. CLXXIX; P. Fraccaro, *Studi sull'età dei Gracchi* I (1914) 31; F. Münzer, *RE* II A 1375.

[31] This work is likely to be identical with the "Catuli literae" mentioned by Fronto, *Epist.*, p. 120 van den Hout: F. Muenzer, *RE* XIII 2075, but see the different opinion of C. Cichorius, *Römische Studien* (1922) 102.

Republican autobiographies to be more than a title to us, conformed to Greek patterns in saying little about private life and much about political struggles and warfare.[32]

The Roman elements of these autobiographies are hardly discernible in the meagre fragments. We learn from Tacitus (*Agricola* 1.3) that not arrogance but reasonable trust in themselves had led Rutilius and Scaurus to write their own memoirs. We catch just a glimpse of Sulla's superstition and belief in "fortuna." Sulla claimed divine protection and portents in his favour to assert his right to rule: so did Augustus later on in his lost autobiography (not to be confused with his *res gestae*). A touch of "charismatic" self-display may well have been a characteristic feature of early Roman autobiographies.

The display of ancestors, the funeral orations, the strong family bias of the annalists must have had their counterpart in the biographies and the autobiographies of Republican Rome, but the evidence is poor.[33] More particularly, Roman aristocratic taste for autobiography is perhaps connected with that peculiar Roman phenomenon: the realistic (or "veristic") portrait of the last century of the Roman Republic. The artists who made such portraits were almost certainly Greek, but they had to take into account the Roman tradition of "imagines maiorum" (wax portraits of ancestors), and even more the desire of the Roman patrons themselves to be represented as practical men with wrinkles and warts. Autobiography as a type of self-exposure may well have something

[32] General information in E. Norden, *Die römische Literatur* (4th ed. 1952) 140–141, and E. Badian, in *Latin Historians*, ed. T. A. Dorey (1966) 23–26. The ancient evidence in H. Peter, *Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae* I (2nd ed. 1914, reprint 1967). On Sulla's autobiography F. Leo, *Ausgewählte Kleine Schriften* I (1960) 252 (from *Hermes* 49 [1914] 164); I. Calabi, *Memorie Accad. Lincei* 8, 3, 5 (1950) 245–302. On Sulla's "fortuna" or "felicitas" see chiefly Plutarch *Sulla* 6. I wonder whether such reflections about oneself were unknown to Greek autobiographies: a subtle discussion in H. Erkell, *Augustus, Felicitas, Fortuna* (1952) 43–128. The appendix to Peter's *Reliquiae*, reprint 1967, gives new bibliography.

[33] Cf. R. E. Smith, "Plutarch's Biographical Sources in the Roman Lives," *Class. Quart.* 34 (1940) 1–10; L. Ferrero, *Rerum Scriptor* (1962) 65–78.

to do with that other type of self-exposure, realistic portraiture. Yet the connection between Roman literature and Roman portraiture is a subject for dangerous speculations; and the very origin of the Roman realistic portrait is a notorious bone of contention.[34]

One fact, however, may be significant in this respect. There is even less possibility of separating autobiography from biography among the Romans than among the Greeks. If modesty about oneself existed only within narrow limits in Rome, modesty about one's own family simply did not exist at all. Republican tradition had consciously been built up on the "exempla maiorum." Roman aristocrats, with few, albeit notable, exceptions, preferred having ancestors in the Fasti to ancestors on Olympus. Aristocrats wrote their lives for the benefit of their descendants, just as they wrote about their own ancestors for personal benefit. If an aristocrat did not think enough about his own glory, "clientes" would do it for him. The Romans were in no danger of having their biographies written by their widows—you will remember Edmund Gosse's lament "The Widow is the worst of all the diseases of biography. She is the triumph of the unfittest."[35] The Romans had their friends and *liberti* to take charge of their autobiographical materials. Sulla's autobiography was completed and edited by his *libertus* Cornelius Epicadus; L. Voltacilius Pitholaus wrote the biographies of his patrons Cn. Pompeius Strabo and Cn. Pompeius Magnus (Suetonius *De grammaticis* 12 and 27). Cicero, who later had his biography written by his *libertus* Tiro (Asconius, p. 48 Clark), sent to Atticus his memorandum on his own consulate (*ad Atticum* 1.19.10; 2.1.1).

[34] Cf. O. Vessberg, *Studien zur Kunstgeschichte der römischen Republik* I (1941); B. Schweitzer, *Die Bildniskunst der römischen Republik* (1948); H. Bouchery, *Gentse Bijdragen tot de Kunstgeschiedenis* 12 (1949–1950) 197–223; G. M. A. Richter, *Proc. Amer. Philosoph. Soc.* 95 (1951) 184; R. Bianchi Bandinelli, *Archeologia e Cultura* (1961) 172–188; V. Poulsen, *Les portraits romains* I, Catalogue of the Ny Carlsberg Glyptothèque of Copenhagen (1962).

[35] *Anglo-Saxon Review* 8 (1901) 205–206.

The feeling that biography is a pillar of the community had not been extraneous to Greek philosophic schools: Peripatetics industriously wrote about Socratics at large. In Rome biography was turned to the advantage of the aristocratic establishment. During the dictatorship of Julius Caesar it became the expression of the most complex attitudes of the ruling class towards Roman and foreign (mainly Greek) values.

St. Jerome considered Varro, Santra, and Nepos the earliest Roman biographers. He probably meant to record their names in chronological order. Varro was apparently working on his *Imagines* in 44 B.C., if Cicero *ad Atticum* 16.11.3 alludes to this work. He finished them about 39. Nepos was still working on his biographies in the late thirties. Santra, whom St. Jerome put between Varro and Nepos, must have been a distinguished writer who dealt mainly with poets and orators. Varro's *De poetis* is irretrievably lost. Only through comparison with later writers, such as Suetonius, did Ritschl and other scholars arrive at the conclusion that Varro wrote brief but comprehensive biographies of Roman poets. We have a more precise idea of his *Imagines* or *Hebdomades*. They were a by-product, with good Hellenistic scholarship, of the work done by Varro in collecting books for the library founded by Caesar. The *Imagines* were planned as a selection of seven hundred portraits of famous men, from kings and statesmen to dancers and priests, via poets, philosophers, historians, and so forth. Each portrait was accompanied by an epigram which characterized the man in question. Learned discussions in prose seem, like footnotes, to have accompanied the poetic text. Aulus Gellius (3.11) mentions a discussion on the chronology of Homer and Hesiod. Two features stand out. Varro placed himself within the Roman aristocratic tradition of *imagines* and *tituli* of ancestors. At the same time he transformed it in a revolutionary way. The *imagines* he chose were not confined to Romans. They were no longer the property of aristocratic families. The portraits of Greek as well as Roman great men were now made available to educated readers. The

spirit of the Caesarian age—with its bold international outlook—could hardly be better symbolized. Pliny the Elder caught this spirit when he said of Varro, "immortalitatem non solum dedit, verum etiam in omnes terras misit, ut praesentes esse ubique ceu di possent" (*Naturalis Historia* 35.11).[36]

Cornelius Nepos developed Varro's notion of biography. He belonged to the circle of Pomponius Atticus at Villa Tamphiliana. There he must have met Varro at leisure. In the circle of Villa Tamphiliana history was a major concern. Atticus himself did a great deal of research into Roman chronology and specialized in genealogies. Nepos wrote three books of a universal history. Then he conceived the idea of a collection of biographies, comparing Greeks and Romans from all walks of life and even including a few Carthaginians and Persians. Foreign kings were followed by Roman kings, Greek politicians by their Roman counterparts. As is well known, the only section fully preserved is that on foreign generals. But we have also two lives—Cato Maior and Pomponius Atticus—and a few other fragments of the section on Roman historians. The life of Cato is the summary made by Nepos himself of a larger biography which he had written at the request of Atticus. The life of Pomponius Atticus represents the second edition, written after Atticus' death. So many nasty things have been said about Nepos' indifference to true scholarship that it is worth pointing out that he understood

[36] Varro wrote his own autobiography, of which almost nothing is known. Some bold conjectures on it in C. Cichorius, *Römische Studien*, 196–200: for possible derivations from it H. Dahlmann, *RE* Suppl. 6, 1251 (mainly Pliny the Elder). On the *imagines* our information depends mainly on Aul. Gell. *N.A.* 3.10–11; Plin. *N.H.* 35.11; Symmach. *Ep.* 1.2.2; 1.4.1; Auson. *Mosella* 305. The basic research is by F. Ritschl and pupils in Ritschl's *Kleine Philologische Schriften* III (1887) 508–592. The fragments of *De poetis* in G. Funaioli, *Grammaticae Romanae Fragmenta* I (1907) 314–319. Cf. esp. F. Leo, *Plautinische Forschungen* (2nd ed. 1912) 63–86 (which is generally important for the Roman biographical tradition). More information in the article by H. Dahlmann on Varro in *RE* Suppl. 6 (1935). F. Della Corte, *Varrone il terzo gran lume romano* (1954), adds little. Cf. now H. Gerstinger, *Jahrb. d. Oesterr. Byzant. Gesellschaft* 17 (1968) 269–278.

the value of Cicero's letters as documents of their age: "quae qui legat, non multum desideret historiam contextam eorum temporum" (*Atticus* 16). He loved to put letters into his biographies: another Hellenistic feature.[37]

Two fragments, which apparently came from Nepos' life of Gaius Gracchus, contain letters by Cornelia to her son Gaius (frag. 58 Malcovati). It is not certain that Cornelia wrote these letters. Nepos may well have been deceived by anti-Gracchan propaganda.[38]

Atticus in his turn imitated Varro in publishing a sort of album of great Roman men in which each of the portraits was accompanied by an epigram of four or five lines (Nepos *Atticus* 18.5–6, Pliny, *Naturalis Historia* 35.11). When Augustus ordered the erection of busts of great men with appropriate inscriptions in the Roman forum and other squares of Italy, he was probably inspired by the compilations of Varro and Atticus.[39] Yet neither Atticus nor Varro nor Nepos, as we have seen, was patriotic in the Augustan sense. They developed new, more international and more humane interests in biography. With Nepos, indeed, biography acquired a new dimension. It became the means by which Greek and Roman men and achievements could be compared. Valerius Maximus and Plutarch are unthinkable without Cornelius Nepos; and Cornelius Nepos must also have helped to familiarize the Romans with the Hellenistic dis-

[37] There is a good recent edition of the lives of Hannibal, Cato, and Atticus by M. Ruch (1968). Cf. K. Büchner, "Humanitas: Zur Atticus-Vita des C.N.," *Gymnasium* 56 (1949) 100–121 = *Studien zur römischen Literatur* I (1964) 19–41, 194–196. Cf. U. Fleischer, *Festschrift B. Snell* (1956) 197–208; H. Rahn, *Hermes* 85 (1957) 205–215. Rahn denies that Nepos edited his biographies twice. But his demonstration does not persuade me. Datames' life seems to have been a later addition. In general G. Wissowa, *RE* IV 1408–1417; M. Schanz and C. Hosius, *Geschichte der röm. Literatur* I (1927) 351–361.

[38] E. Fraenkel, *Leseproben aus Reden Ciceros und Catos* (1968) 161–163, is the latest eminent scholar to believe unconditionally in the authenticity of Cornelia's letters: his predecessors include Mommsen and F. Leo. But see the cautious remarks by P. Fraccaro, *Opuscula* II (1957) 43.

[39] A. Degrassi, *Inscriptiones Italiae* XIII 3, *Elogia* (1937). On the *Elogia* of Tarquinia the recent discovery by M. Torelli, *Studi Etruschi* 36 (1968) 467–470 throws new light (with bibl.).

tinction between history and biography.[40] Nepos' biographies were still appreciated at the end of the fourth century. We know the name of one of the learned men who read (and perhaps copied) Cornelius Nepos under Theodosius I or Theodosius II. For some unexplained accident of the manuscript tradition the name of this man—(Aemilius?) Probus—displaced that of Nepos as the author of the lives of foreign generals. Early Italian humanists (such as Sicco Polenton) discovered the mistake when they compared these lives with those of Cato and Atticus, which had remained attributed to Cornelius Nepos.[41]

Surrounded by this concern with biography which he had found in Rome about 30 B.C., Dionysius of Halicarnassus exploited biographical data for settling questions of authenticity in his writings on Greek orators.[42]

Biography gained prestige in the Imperial age for contradictory reasons. Biography was the natural form of telling the story of a Caesar. On the other hand, biography was a vehicle for unorthodox political and philosophic ideas. To write biographies or encomia of Paetus Thrasea and of Helvidius Priscus (as Arulenus Rusticus and Herennius Senecio did) became a capital offence under the tyranny of Domitian. What is characteristic of the age of Plutarch, Tacitus, and Suetonius is that these writers refused to yield to the

[40] *Pelopidas* 1: "Vereor, si res explicare incipiam, ne non vitam eius enarrare, sed historiam videar scribere." The distinction is implied, I believe, in *Ad Herennium* 1.8.13 and Cic. *De invent.* 1.19.27, but the point is by no means certain. Asclepiades in Sextus Emp. *Adv. Mathem.* 1.253.

[41] L. Traube, *Sitzungsb. Bayer. Akad.*, 1891, 409–425 = *Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen* III (1920) 20–30; M. Schanz, *Gesch. der röm. Literatur* I, 2 (3rd ed., 1909) 154–155; W. A. Baehrens, *Hermes* 50 (1915) 266–270. The interpretation of (Aemilius) Probus' epigram at the end of the life of Hannibal, which is at the root of the mistake, is not yet beyond doubt. It may have nothing to do with Cornelius Nepos. On Sicco Polenton, R. Sabbadini, *Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci ne' secoli XIV e XV* (1905, reprint 1967) 186. D. Lambinus in his commentary on Nepos (Paris 1569), introduction, got all the essential facts right. An attempt to explain "Aemilius" in S. Mazzarino, *Stilicone* (1942) 244 n. 3.

[42] We can judge Dionysius mainly from his pamphlet on Dinarchus: ed. G. Marenghi (Milano 1970).

"felicitas temporum" and to let biography become an instrument of Imperial propaganda. Plutarch—so far as we can judge from his surviving biographies of Roman emperors—was no panegyrist. Tacitus wrote one biography only; it was not of an emperor. Suetonius wrote biographies of Caesars which applied to the emperors methods of description and documentation more usually meant to satisfy curiosity about literary men—common mortals.

It is pleasant to conclude by noting that Roman biography contributed to keeping emperors within the bounds of mortality.

Conclusion

Though our evidence for the fifth century B.C. is admittedly poor, the first Greek biographies and autobiographies seem to belong to the period between 500 and 480 B.C. and to be contemporary with the first works on genealogy and periegesis.

One of the spectacular features of intellectual life in the fifth century is the development of a new branch of research: history. History implies an attempt to put order into the knowledge of remote and recent events on the basis of rational principles of source criticism. Some items of information are found to be better than others. The notion of cause is systematically applied to human events and becomes an essential part of their interpretation. Three elements contribute to the new notion of history: doubt about traditional myths and genealogies; curiosity about foreign lands and institutions; interest in the variety of human types, within and without the same nation. But what gives historical research its distinctive flavour and maturity is increasing subordination of genealogy and travel accounts to the critical narration of political and military events—more specifically to recent Greek political and military events. Herodotus and Thucydides are of course the principal names associated with this development. Their prestige overshadowed all other achievements of fifth-century investigation of human affairs. The study of local history, institutions, customs, and vocabulary existed in the fifth century but was less influential and renowned than the study of political history.

The Development of Greek Biography

EXPANDED EDITION

Arnaldo Momigliano

Harvard University Press
Cambridge, Massachusetts
London, England 1993